THE

# ANASTASIS OF THE DEAD:

OR,

## PHILOSOPHY OF HUMAN IMMORTALITY,

AS DEDUCED FROM

## THE TEACHINGS OF THE SCRIPTURE WRITERS,

IN REFERENCE TO

## "THE RESURRECTION."

BY JASON LEWIS.

"Οτι δε εγειρονται οἱ νεκροι και Μωσης εμηνυσε."
"Now that the dead are raised, even Moses showed."

BOSTON:
PUBLISHED BY A. TOMPKINS,
38 & 40 CORNHILL.
1860.

BT871
.L6

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1859,

BY JASON LEWIS,

In the Clerk's Office of the District Court for the Western District of Pennsylvania.

# PREFACE.

---

The An-a-sta-sis of the Dead," instead of the Resurrection of the Dead, may seem improper, it being unusual; but if for that which is scripturally symbolized by those expressions, we really *must* use a term other than the plain Anglo-Saxon "rising," (or "raising,") why not sometimes *ana-stasis*, from a word out of the original Greek of the Evangelists and Apostles, as well as always *re-surrection*, from a word out of the Latin Version of the Romish Church?

The author of the following work is entirely confident that its leading theme — the scripture doctrine of the anastasis or rising of the dead — has a most intimate connection with the true philosophy of the after-death life; hence that were the subject generally viewed in its true light, thousands would come to regard it with a great degree of interest, who now seem to consider it as scarcely worthy a moment's consideration. For these reasons and others, he deems such a work called for; and in the spirit of that scripture which says, "I believed, therefore have I spoken," he, believing, has therefore written, regretting only that he does not wield an abler pen.

In pursuing the course that appeared to be marked out for him, he has found himself, in some instances, quite out of the beaten track; but at such times the light from the holy Book has seemed to shine more brightly along the way, indicating,—as is believed,—the primitive path.

That form of faith which regards the rising of the dead, even as the death of the living, to be a *normal* process, provided for by the author of man's nature, and, through spiritual agencies, going on continually,—the whole in accordance with the original laws of our being,—is doubtless, not quite unknown to the christian public; yet such a belief is thought not to be enunciated in any of the creeds; and the number of those professing it is obviously not large; — the writer, therefore, for sheer *loneliness* as to this, has made a somewhat frequent use of the first and third persons singular.

It being impossible to do the subject anything like justice without correcting sundry erroneous renderings in the common English version of the scriptures, it has hence been necessary to advert to the Greek of the New Testament more frequently than is to be desired in a work designed for general reading.

While he has not altogether neglected availing himself of the helps within his reach, he has not thought proper to load the pages of his work with references to writers, however eminent, excepting only the writers of the scriptures.

In quotations from the scripture writers, the Common Version is followed, for the most part, with the excep-

tion that a few merely verbal changes are made, (out of the many which should be,) as *to* for "unto,"— *those* for "they" or "them," when used as a definitive or demonstrative pronoun,— *who* for "which," when relating to a person or persons. And whenever any material departure from its renderings is deemed indispensable, due notice is usually given *at the time;* since probably, no translation was ever more religiously venerated than is this, excepting, perhaps, the Vulgate Latin.

In citing scriptural testimony, only so much — in general — is given of a text, or of a passage, as is adapted to the illustration, or to the proof, of the point then in hand.

Throughout the work, it is constantly taken for granted that a general doctrinal harmony among the several parts of the scriptures truly exists; also, that such harmony will be apparent if to the language of each text shall be given the rightful interpretation. And it is held that, in most cases, the surest method of determining the true sense of any portion of the sacred writings, is, to compare scripture with scripture.

That the work may prove instrumental in correcting some of the doctrinal errors extant among christians,— that it may tend to induce in the minds of believers a faith having more of the scriptual vitality and reformatory power manifested in the apostolic age,— that it may lead to the more general profession of a hope which, taking firm, unfailing hold of the spiritual unseen, is, therefore, steadfast, lively, purifying, and sat-

isfactory,— in a word, that it may, to some appreciable extent, promote the best interests of the cause of christian truth,— is the sincere desire of the writer; and its accomplishment, by the blessing of God, will be his best reward. J. L.

December, 1859.

# CONTENTS OF THE WORK.


CHAPTER I.
Jewish Opinions ..... 9

CHAPTER II.
Scriptural Definitions ..... 17

CHAPTER III.
The Same — Continued ..... 26

CHAPTER IV.
The Same — Continued ..... 36

CHAPTER V.
The Same — Continued ..... 47

CHAPTER VI.
The Same — Continued ..... 54

CHAPTER VII.
The Same — Concluded ..... 64

CHAPTER VIII.
Mortalization in Adam ..... 75

CHAPTER IX.
Annihilation ..... 79

CHAPTER X.
Death of the Soul ..... 90

CHAPTER XI.
Sleep of the Soul ..... 97

CHAPTER XII.
The Same — Concluded ..... 104

CHAPTER XIII.
Resurrection of the Earthly Body ..... 113

CHAPTER XIV.
Doctrine of Two Resurrections ..... 124

CHAPTER XV.
The Same — Concluded ..... 130

CHAPTER XVI.
The Last or General Judgment ..... 143

CHAPTER XVII.
The Same — Concluded ..... 151

CHAPTER XVIII.
Endless Punishment ..... 162

CHAPTER XIX.
The Same — Concluded ..... 171
CHAPTER XX.
The Last-Day Resurrection ..... 182
CHAPTER XXI.
Disembodied State and Simultaneous Universal Resurrection. 194
CHAPTER XXII.
A General Objection against many of the Popular Views relating to the Resurrection ..... 198
CHAPTER XXIII.
Concerning Angels ..... 203
CHAPTER XXIV.
The Same — Continued ..... 215
CHAPTER XXV.
The Same — Concluded ..... 227
CHAPTER XXVI.
A Present or Passing Resurrection ..... 237
CHAPTER XXVII.
The Same — Continued ..... 246
CHAPTER XXVIII.
The Same — Continued ..... 253
CHAPTER XXIX.
The Same — Concluded ..... 262
CHAPTER XXX.
The Manner of the Resurrection ..... 268
CHAPTER XXXI.
The Primitive Gospel ..... 277
CHAPTER XXXII.
Our Lord's Crucifixion, &c ..... 283
CHAPTER XXXIII.
Our Saviour's Resurrection, &c ..... 293
CHAPTER XXXIV.
Christ's Ascension ..... 301
CHAPTER XXXV.
Proofs of a Future Life ..... 304
CHAPTER XXXVI.
An Improved Translation of 1 Cor. xv ..... 315
CHAPTER XXXVII.
The End of Human Mortality ..... 324

# THE ANASTASIS OF THE DEAD.

## CHAPTER I.

### JEWISH OPINIONS.

In order that certain Scripture texts and passages may be the more readily understood, the opinions of the Jews as to the resurrection, in the times of the New Testament writers, requires to be briefly set forth. Such a presentation is also desirable from the fact that although the distinguishing doctrines of neither the Pharisees nor the Sadducees have been received *entire* among Christians, yet at least some small portion of "the leaven" of the one sect, or the other, or both, seems to have been "hid in" — or incorporated with — nearly every creed in Christendom.

From various passages in the New Testament, it appears that the sect of the Jews called "Pharisees" admitted the fact of a resurrection; but that those styled "Sadducees" denied it altogether. And as concerned this particular topic, the great mass of "the people," — analogous to those who, in these times, are denominated "non-professors," — seem mostly to have sympathized with the Pharisees.

Many readers of the Bible appear to suppose, and without ever having suspected their error, that it was the *Christian* doctrine of the resurrection which was held by the Pharisees and their adherents. Scarce anything, however, could be further from the truth.

The Evangelist Luke relates that, at a certain time, our Lord asked his disciples who "the people said He was; and that the disciples replied, "John, the Baptist; but some say, Elias; and others say, that one of the old prophets *is risen again*." [1]

It is also related that "Herod, the tetrarch, heard of all that was done by Him: and he was perplexed, because that it was said by some, that John *was risen* from the dead; and by some, that Elias had appeared; and by others, that one of the old prophets *was risen again*." From Matthew and Mark, it would seem that, after a little, the tetrarch actually got his mind made up in regard to Jesus, and said, "This is John the Baptist; he *is risen* from the dead." [2]

From these Scriptures, it is easy to see that the *rising* therein mentioned, was thought to be *to a state of mortality on the earth.* In other words, it was a sort of metempsychosis, or soul transmigration, which it is presumed no one supposes to be the Christian doctrine of the resurrection of the dead.

That the Pharisee doctrine concerning the resurrection was equivalent, so far as it went, to the Pythagorean doctrine of transmigration, is apparent also from the writings of Josephus, the Jewish historian, who represents the Pharisees as believing, in opposition to the Sadducees, "that souls

[1] Luke ix. 18, 19.
[2] Luke ix. 7, 8; Matt. xiv. 1, 2; Mark vi. 14, 16.

have an immortal vigor in them," and that such as "have lived virtuously, . . . . shall have power to revive and live again." He also declares of them, "They say that all souls are incorruptible, but that the souls of good men only are removed into other bodies." [1]

It may perhaps be true, as some have supposed, that by "good men," in the last quotation, Josephus secretly meant Israelites, or the descendants of Abraham, — in a word, Jews, — irrespective of other good qualities. If so, then this was actually the Pharisees' doctrine; and then, too, it would seem to have been for the purpose of correcting this national assumption of inherited righteousness, that *Jesus* pronounced Zaccheus, the publican, to be "a son of Abraham," his *conduct* being good; and also said of Nathaniel, a Jew, (which perhaps Zaccheus was not,) "Behold an Israelite indeed!" adding, — to show what made him an Israelite so emphatically, — "*in whom is no guile.*" Paul also wrote, "He is a Jew who is one inwardly;" and John, the baptizer, — the Elias of that age, — lectured the Pharisees and Sadducees most severely upon that same topic.

(Would that in this nineteenth century, some Elias-John, or John-Elias, might be "sent from God," with the ability effectually to arouse the Pharisees and Sadducees of the Christian world, to the propriety and duty of manifesting the practical "fruits" of faith in HIM whose "law" for the regulation of social intercourse, behold, is it not written in Matt. vii. 12?)

But however the facts may have been at the time Josephus wrote, it is evident that in our *Saviour's* day it was thought to be quite possible

[1] Antiquities of the Jews, Book XVIII. chap. i, section 3; Jewish War, Book II. chap. viii. sect. 14.

for the soul of a *Jewish* sinner to pass into an other body; and that such soul was likely to be punished, in its new tabernacle, with some physical calamity or defect. Thus John tells us that in reference to a man "*blind* from his birth," Christ's disciples asked of Christ, "Master, who did sin, this man, or his parents, that he was born blind?" — as much as to ask whether he was born thus as a punishment to himself, for sins committed in a previous life, or as a punishment to his parents for their sins.[1]

From the same evangelist we also learn that after Jesus had bestowed on this man the gift of sight, the Pharisees, unable to refute his argument, that Christ must have been sent from God seeing He had done so great a miracle, vented their spite against him, not only by ejecting him from the synagogue, but also by taunting him in these words: "Thou wast altogether *born in sins*, and dost thou teach us?"[2]

The phrase "born in sins" has been taken, — though unusually, — as a *proverbial* expression, importing simply that the person to whom it is applied is a great sinner. This I admit to be its meaning, by implication; yet, from the circumstance that it was applied to the blind man by some of "the Pharisees," as John is particular to inform us, I can not resist the conviction that the sense they intended to convey by it is specifically this, that the sins of a former life adhered to him at his birth, so that he was, as it were, *enveloped* in sins when born. There can be no doubt that they meant to denounce him as a very great sinner; but in what way could they do this any more readily, than by *twitting* him of having had an accumulation of sins to begin life with?

[1] John ix. 2. [2] John ix. 34.

This case also throws some light upon the supposed *manner* and *time* of such resurrections, or soul transmigrations; since it was evidently thought that the pre-existent soul of the blind man was born with him. So, also, when the people accounted for the teachings and miracles of Jesus, that in him was exemplified the rising of Elias, or some one of the old prophets, they unquestionably deemed that whose soul soever He possessed, it had inhabited his body from the first.

But this passing of the soul before or at birth, was not supposed to be the only period of its migration, though it likely was thought to be the ordinary one. When it was said by Herod and others, that John, the Baptist,—the time of whose death was but a little while previous,—had arisen from the dead, and was to be seen in the person of Jesus of Nazareth, it is manifest that if they thought as they spoke, they must have thought that the soul of John had taken an *adult* body.

The supposed resurrection of the Baptist in the person of the Saviour, may also serve to show how very closely connected were the notions of the Pharisees concerning the resurrection, and their notions in regard to persons being "possessed" with demons. ("Devils," in the Com. Ver.) It is a fact that the possessing spirits or "devils" in which they believed,—properly *demons*,—were supposed by them to be the spirits of *dead* persons. See chap. vii. of this work.

In the case above adverted to, of John's resurrection, as supposedly witnessed in Christ, if it was thought, as it seemingly must have been, that the soul of the Baptist had taken up its abode in Christ's body, and had either dispossessed its former occupant, or else was holding it in complete subjection, wherein does this differ, as to the *philosophy*

of the thing, from possession by devils or demons? The *modus operandi* of the two are manifestly identical, they differing only as the character of the inhabiting spirits were supposed to differ. Thus,

"Herod," astonished at the report of our Lord's "mighty works," * concluded that the soul of John was acting through him, John being probably the only prophet he had ever heard much about, and he having put John to death. "The people," entertaining a favorable opinion of Jesus as a religious teacher, either came to the same conclusion as Herod, or else supposed that the soul of some *ancient* prophet was in him. "The Scribes and Pharisees," who hated him, and sought to destroy his influence, alleged that he had a devil or demon.

Note. The demons or possessing spirits believed in by the Jews at this period, seem to have been uniformly evil-disposed.

---

The Sadducees not only rejected the Pharisee resurrection, but also seem to have contended that all there is of man dies at the death of the body. Josephus declares expressly, "The doctrine of the Sadducees is this, that souls die with the bodies." Again, he tells us "that they take away the belief of the immortal duration of the soul." [1] In Acts, we read, "For the Sadducees say that there is no resurrection, neither angel, nor spirit; but the Pharisees confess both." [2]

Taking the above quotations together, it is apparent that the Sadducees denial of any resur-

* It would seem that the tetrarch had been absent from the country for a time.

[1] Antiquities, Book XVIII. chap. i. sec. 3; Jewish War, Book II. chap. viii. sec. 14.

[2] Acts xxiii. 8.

rection, was equivalent to a denial of any after-death life. Also, that their denial of the existence of spirits and angels, was not in regard to the existence of spirits or souls in earthly bodies, nor in regard to men's being sometimes *sent* from God, and so being at such times His angels or messengers;— but simply in regard to there being any spirits, or any angels, apart from earthly bodies; they holding that when the body dies the spirit dies with it, and so has no further existence.

---

Having spoken of Elias in connection with John the Baptist, it may not be uncalled for to offer some remarks illustrative of those passages which speak of the *coming* of the former as fulfilled in the advent of the latter.

From a promise recorded in the last two verses of the Old Testament, the Jews had naturally imbibed the idea that the prophet Elijah —, "Elias," in Greek, — would come personally upon earth *before* the advent of their expected Messiah or Christ. Hence when John the Baptist appeared, and commenced his career as a religious reformer, "the Jews" —, as John the Evangelist informs us, — "sent Priests and Levites from Jerusalem to ask him, "Who art thou?" And when he had "confessed" that he was "not the Christ," they asked him, "What then? Art thou Elias?" To which he unequivocally responded, "I am not." And yet, according to an other evangelist, it was actually declared by the very Christ himself that John *was* Elias.[1]

The apparent contradiction which these statements present, will wholly disappear by duly considering certain circumstances:

[1] John i. 19–21; Matt. xi. 14; xvii. 13.

1. An angel had prophesied to Zacharias, that his son John should go before the Lord "*in the spirit and power of Elias;* also, that he should "turn the hearts of the fathers to the children," &c.; and this last is the very work which, according to Malachi, was to be done by Elijah the prophet.[1]

2. When we read of the Priests and Levites going to ask John who he was, we are very carefully informed that his questioners were "of the Pharisees,"[2] who, as we have seen, held the doctrine of the transmigration of souls.

In the light of the above-mentioned circumstances, the following view of the subject would seem to be the correct one:

When the Baptist *denied* being Elias, he merely denied that the soul or spirit of "Elijah the Tishbite" inhabited his body. But when Jesus affirmed that John *was* Elias, he affirmed that he was so in the Scriptural sense, by manifesting that prophet's spirit and power, which is to say, his manner, and his efficiency. He *was* Elias, in the sense intended in Malachi. He was *not* Elias, in the sense in which that prediction was understood by many of the Jews at the time of John's appearance.

With the above view of the case, how interesting to note that the evangelist, when he tells of John's being questioned as to who he was, takes pains to add, as we have before said, what may have often been deemed a worthless remark, "And those who were sent were of the Pharisees."

How careful also was Jesus to *qualify* his declaration as to John's *being* Elias! "*If ye will receive it,*" said he, — that is, if you will take what I am about to say in the right sense, — "this *is* Elias who was to come."

[1] Luke i. 17; Mal. iv. 5, 6. [2] John i. 24.

## CHAPTER II.

### SCRIPTURAL DEFINITIONS;

OR REMARKS UPON THE SCRIPTURAL USAGE AND SIGNIFICATIONS OF CERTAIN WORDS AND PHRASES EMPLOYED BY THE SCRIPTURE WRITERS IN CONNECTION WITH THE SUBJECT OF THE AFTER-DEATH LIFE AND ITS RELATIONS.

---

[It not unfrequently happens that an author's meaning is sadly misapprehended from the fact of his neglecting to acquaint his readers in what sense he uses some particular word or words of doubtful import. The writing of this, and of several subsequent chapters, has been undertaken *partly* on this account, the author of the present work being greatly desirous that his language shall be properly and fully understood.]

---

The *spirit* or *soul* of man is that entity which possesses and exercises the faculty of thinking, whose organ is the body as a whole. In other words, "the soul" or "the spirit" of a man, is the man himself, considered apart from his bodily organization. Yet the words "spirit" and "soul," like the Greek terms so rendered, are used in a variety of significations, both in the Scriptures and elsewhere. (Note. In this work, I use those terms in the sense above specified, unless I intimate to the contrary.)

The Greek word usually rendered "spirit" is πνευμα — *pneuma*, primarily denoting *wind*, from the verb *pneo*, to blow. As employed in the New Testament, *pneuma* signifies, for the most part, *spirit;* a spiritual being; a spiritual influence; temper of

mind. It is once rendered "wind;" "The wind bloweth where it listeth." (John iii. 8.) In one passage, it has the sense of *apparition*, or unreal appearance. Thus,

In Luke's Gospel, we are told that when Jesus showed himself to His disciples in the evening of the day of his resurrection, they, at first, were very greatly frightened, supposing Him to be "a spirit;" and that, upon this, He showed them his hands and his feet, reasoned with them in regard to their fears, invited them to handle him, and said, "a spirit hath not flesh and bones as ye see Me have."[1] Here *pneuma* seems to be twice used for *phantasma*, the word made use of by both Matthew and Mark in relating that the disciples, in great terror, cried out, "It is a *spirit*," when they saw Jesus walking on the sea.[2] *Phantasma* imports phantasm, phantom, apparition, special illusion, &c.

The Greek word usually rendered "soul" is ψυχη — *psuche*,— frequently Anglicised into psyche, — primarily denoting *breath*, from the verb *psucho*, to breathe. As used in the New Testament, it denotes *soul*, as synonymous with spirit; a person; a living creature or animal; one's own self; human bodily life. In one place in the Common Version, it is twice rendered "life" in one sentence; and then, in the next sentence, is twice rendered "soul."[3]

The expressions "my soul," "his soul," &c., are sometimes scripturally put for the mere pronouns, I, me, he, him, &c. Thus Jesus, in the garden of Gethsemane, instead of saying, "I am exceedingly sorrowful," &c., employed the style of the ancient prophets, and, to his three attendant disciples, emphatically, plaintively, pleadingly said, "*My soul*

[1] Luke xxiv. 37–39. [2] Matt. xiv. 26; Mark vi. 49.
[3] Matt. xvi. 25, 26

is exceedingly sorrowful, even to death: tarry ye here, and watch with me."[1]

The *life* of the body, denominated physical, corporeal, or animal life, is that power, or principle, or whatever else it may be called, in connection with which this earthly body or organization is built up and sustained. Hence *dying*, in the ordinary sense of speaking, is but the departure of the life-power from the body.

There are two principal Greek words rendered "life." The one is *psuche*, often rendered "soul," and already defined; the other, ζωη — *zoë*, from the verb *zao*, (originally *zoö*,) to live, to be alive. Zoé denotes, for the most part, a mode or manner of being, literal or figurative.

The word *man* (,Greek *anthropos*,) more usually includes in its meaning both the body and the spirit or soul; but, in a few instances, it has reference merely to the body. Yet, philosophically, the spirit or soul is the man, and his body is merely the organism by means of which he holds intercourse with the world around him.

Some consider man to be a compound being, apart from his organization, they having discovered, as they inform us, that there are *two* distinct and opposite *principles* in man, the one, good, the other, evil. Yet these principles —, granting their existence, — are manifestly but *attributes* of the spirit or soul; and they no more show that each human being exists in a state of *duality*, than the various propensities and sentiments common to men show that each individual has twenty-five, or fifty, or one hundred souls.

Death is often represented as a *falling*, especially in accounts of battles, a dead body being incapable

[1] Matt. xxvi. 38. See also Acts ii. 27, 31; Ps. xvi. 10; Judges x. 16.

of maintaining an erect position. This mode of speech seems to have prevailed from very remote antiquity, it being met with in the books of Moses.[1] So, also, as a carrying out of this figure, the idea of coming to life, after actual death, and the idea of being brought to life, under such circumstances, have been commonly expressed by *rising*, and by *being raised* — regaining an erect position, and being caused to regain it. Such act and such state are usually expressed in English by the word "resurrection."

In like manner, dying is frequently symbolized by *sleeping*, the expressions, to *sleep*, to *have slept*, and the like, being employed in the sense of to *die*, to *have died*, &c. Sleep is thus put for death probably to intimate an after-death life; since, to all minds, sleeping unequivocally implies waking. And in accordance with this usage, is the fact that one of the Greek words for rising, raising, and being raised, when the dead are in mention, primarily signifies to awake, to be awaked, &c.

There are two words in the Greek Testament rendered "rise," "raise," &c., in connection with the subject of the future life. These are ανιστημι — *anistemi*, and εγειρω — *egeiro*, the latter of which has frequently the *passive* form, *egeiromai*, to be raised. In like manner,

There are two Greek words rendered "resurrection." These are αναστασις — *anastasis*, and εγερσις — *egersis*. The latter, however, occurs in the New Testament but once. (Matt. xxvii. 53.)

The Greek verb *anistemi* comes from the preposition *ana*, again, and the verb *istemi*, to stand. It consequently signifies to *stand again*, that is, to *rise* to an erect position; or, transitively, to *cause* to stand again, that is, to *raise*. It may also some-

[1] Genesis xiv. 10; Exodus xxxii. 28; Numbers xiv. 29.

times have the sense of to *arouse*, as if from a state of inactivity. In the *passive* sense, to *be raised* or aroused, it is not often used.

The verb *egeiro* primarily signifies to *awaken*, at if from sleep, or to *arouse*, as if from inaction; yes, in the New Testament, it is much more commonly used in the sense of to *raise*, or, when having the *passive* form, in the sense of to *be raised*. Though it sometimes signifies merely to *awake*, it seldom or never, in the New Testament, has the mere intransitive sense of to *rise*, though it is often made to bear that sense in the common version. See chap. xxxiii. of this work.

Anistemi supposes the riser to have *fallen* from a standing posture, as if by some casualty; egeiro, his having *reclined*, as if for sleep or rest. Accordingly, a return from death as if from sleep, is more naturally expressed by egeiro than by anistemi. In one text, where both words occur in the same sentence, the former is rendered "awake," and the latter "arise:" "Awake thou who sleepest, and arise from the dead." (Eph. v. 14.)

The Greek noun *anastasis*, mostly rendered "resurrection," is from *ana*, again, and *stasis*, the act or state of standing, or causing to stand, or being caused to stand. (*Stasis* is from istemi.) Anastasis, therefore signifies the act or state of rising, raising, or being raised.

The noun *egersis* is from the verb *egeiro*, and has the sense indicated by its derivation.

The English word *resurrection*, from the Latin resurrectio, — and this from the Latin resurgo, compounded of *re* and *surgo*, — seems properly to import a re-rising, or rising *again;* but the Scriptures not having been written in either English or Latin, the question is not as to the original specific import of these words, but only as to that of the

Greek anastasis and its kindred terms. The prefix *ana* (, which, in composition, sometimes becomes "*an*,") has indeed the sense of *re;* and if istemi, like surgo, signifies to *rise*, then *an*istemi would truly import to *re*-rise, or rise *again*. But seeing that istemi, by itself, signifies simply to stand, or to cause to stand, the prefix in mention does not give it the sense of to re-rise or re-raise, but simply to rise or raise, — literally to re-stand, or stand again, or get up, or cause some one to do so. And the like may be said of anastasis.

So, also, since falling *down* expresses no more than falling, that is, when a mere standing posture on a level is what is fallen from, it seems at best a pleonasm —, an allowable one perhaps, — to speak of rising *up*, or of being raised *up*, after having fallen in such circumstances. Getting up, being set up, &c., are strictly proper expressions; and these, by the way, are analogous to anistemi.

The Greek terms rendered "rise," "raise," &c., are obviously used in a *secondary* sense when applied to the subject of life after death.

In one passage at least, anastasis seems equivalent to resurrection *world*, or after-death mode of being. Thus the Sadducee doctors demanded of Christ, "In the anastasis whose wife," &c.; and He responded, "In the anastasis they neither marry, nor are given in marriage." These Sadducees also, in the expression, "and raise up seed [or offspring] to his brother," employ the word *anistemi* in an unusual sense.[1]

In one passage also, *egeiro* (in the passive form) seems to be expressive of the *growth* or development of the resurrection body from the unfoldment of a *germ* —, so to call it, — contained in the earthly body: "It is sown a natural [*or* animal]

[1] Matthew xxii. 24.

body; it is raised a spiritual body. (1 Cor. xv. 44.) See chap. xxxv.

The expression "the dead" has a *plural* force. It is analagous, in this respect, to the expressions "the living," "the learned," "the wise," "the wicked," &c. The like may be said of "*hoi nekroi*," the Greek expression for the dead, which, in all its variations of *case*, is plural not only in sense, but in form. It appears, then, that, in general,

By "the dead" are meant the dead persons, which is to say, those who have died. The expression *may* import dead bodies, as in certain texts in the Old Testament to be commented upon in chap. xvii; also, when it was said of Christ to the women at His tomb, "He is risen from the dead;" also, when used the second time in the text, "Let the dead bury their dead." * But in this sense it is seldom used.

The resurrection *of* the dead, and the resurrection FROM the dead, are by no means synonymous expressions. In the former phrase, the dead are the ones that rise; in the latter, the dead are those who are *left* by the person rising.

"The resurrection of the dead" is a phrase applicable to all or any who have died or are to die. Witness the words of Paul before Felix, concerning "a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust;" also his argument in 1 Corinthians, chapter xv, that as surely as Christ rose *from* the dead, so surely there is a resurrection OF the dead. But,

The resurrection *from* the dead is affirmed only of those few persons whose real or supposed risings were, or were thought to be, manifest to the

* "Let the spiritually dead do the burying of dead bodies." Free Translation of Luke ix. 60.

*senses* of persons in the flesh; as for example, Jesus of Nazareth, Lazarus of Bethany, John the Baptist in the person of Jesus, &c.

An apparent exception to the statement that rising *from* the dead supposes being visible among mortals, is found in the well-known account of a conversation our Saviour had with the Sadducees. In two of the evangelists, the expression "from the dead" is applied by our Lord to the rising of the persons mentioned, notwithstanding He obviously did not intend to affirm that their rising was or would be into this mortal state. Yet, as I view the probabilities of the case, it was thought by his questioners that the rising of those persons was *believed* by Him to be into this mortal state; for surely the resurrection held by the Pharisees was altogether of that sort; and the Sadducees would very naturally suppose that that was his doctrine also. With this view of the matter, I seem to see very clearly why it was that in replying to the objection which the Sadducees had so artfully wrapped up in their question, the guileless Saviour adopted, to a certain extent, the popular phraseology. To escape the charge of caviling, he avoided even the appearance of it.

The Pharisees' resurrection was specifically a rising of the dead from the dead; and so that form of expression had become common; and so Christ employed it in his reply to the Sadducees. In like manner, when they asked, "*In the resurrection* whose wife," &c., he made answer, "*In the resurrection* they neither marry," &c. They having used anastasis for resurrection world or state, He so used it in his reply. But with all this he was scrupulously careful that the *matter* of his reply should be such as that "the people," if not also his questioners, could scarcely avoid seeing that

the doctrine held by Him —, it being that of a rising to *im*mortality, and of course *not* into this earthly state, — was by no means the same as that of the Pharisees; and hence that to *His* doctrine the argument arising out of the Sadducees' puzzling question was totally irrelevant.

In one place it does indeed seem as if the resurrection *from* the dead were unequivocally used for the resurrection *of* the dead, and in such manner also as goes to show that the two phrases are strictly synonymous. This, however, is but a false seeming, arising, wholly or mainly, from a false translation. We are told in the common version, that Peter and John "preached *through* Jesus the resurrection from the dead." (Acts iv. 1, 2.) The Greek, however, is, "announced *in* Jesus," &c. (*En to Iesou*, literally, "in the of Jesus, or "in that of Jesus.") That is, they announced the startling fact that "in the [case] of Jesus," there had lately occurred an actual rising of a human being out from among the company of the dead.

## CHAPTER III.

### SCRIPTURAL DEFINITIONS — CONTINUED.

In the phrase "from the dead," the word "from" is a rendering either of απο = *apo*, or of εκ = ek (sometimes written εξ = *ex*.) The sense of these words, when employed as in the given phrase, is as follows:

The Greek preposition *apo*, when used with a verb of motion, signifies "from" or "away from," in the sense of "away from the *place* of."

The Greek preposition *ek*, (*ex* before a vowel,) when employed with a verb of motion, and followed by a word in the *singular number*, signifies "out of" or "from," in the sense of "out from the *interior* of" the object in mention. But when followed by a *plural* word, and used with a verb of motion, the term *ek* or *ex* signifies "from" or "from among," in the sense of "out from being *among*" the group or company mentioned.

In illustration of the above, take, *from among* those few to be found, the following examples *out of* the common version, in which "out of" and "from among" are a rendering of the same preposition:

> "There came a voice out of the cloud.
> Out of the heart proceed evil thoughts.
> Out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh.
> Every high-priest taken from among men.
> Put away from among yourselves that wicked person."

In the phrase "from the dead," as it occurs in the New Testament, the word "from" is a rendering of *apo* only four times in upward of forty. In three of those four instances, the reference to *place* is very express; in the other, it is readily inferred. Thus,

At the tomb of the Saviour, an angel said, "Come see the *place* where the Lord lay. And go quickly, and tell his disciples that He is risen from the dead." (Apo.) So, also, when a military guard was set around his tomb, it was done lest—, as his enemies foolishly feared, — his disciples should remove his body from that place by stealth, and then say, "He is risen from the dead." (Apo.) So, too, in the parable, the Rich man finding himself in a "*place* of torment," petitions his national father to have Lazarus sent to the house of his immediate father, for the purpose of warning his five brethren against coming to where he then was; and on Abraham's suggesting that they, having Moses and the prophets, might receive sufficient warning from that source, he rejoins, with much earnestness, "Nay, father Abraham, but if one went to them from the dead," &c.[1] (Apo.)

That in the three passages above adverted to, the phrase "from the dead" has the sense of "from the *place* of the dead," seems well-nigh self-declaratory. In the remaining passage, where one evangelist makes *Herod* to have used *apo* in saying that the Baptist had arisen from the dead, while another evangelist makes him to have employed the word *ek*, we may easily conceive that the tetrarch sometimes contemplated John as having just come away from a Pharisaic *place* of souls, and at other times as having come out from among the thousands there congregated; and that he ac-

[1] Matt. xxviii. 6, 7, xxvii. 62 66; Luke xvi. 27–31.

cordingly used sometimes the one word, and sometimes the other, and each in its proper specific sense. So, in the parable just adverted to, the Rich man uses *apo* in the phrase "from the dead," but Abraham in his reply employs the word *ek;* yet this does by no means show that the two words are synonymous. In the mind of the Rich man, *locality* is decidedly uppermost, he being, parabolically, in a torment-giving *place;* while, on the other hand, Abraham, at the close, is made to drop the figure of locality, and to declare the *moral* of the parable, namely, that the Jews, as a nation, being, as it were, *deaf* to the teachings of Moses and the prophets, were ready to reject Christianity though they should be favored with the highest evidence of its truth —— though One should arise "from the dead," that is, from among the dead. (*Ek.*)

The expression "from the dead," as employed in connection with *the resurrection of Jesus Christ*, occurs in the New Testament upward of twenty times. In only two of these instances is the preposition *apo* used; and *then* the reference is not to a place of *souls*, but simply to a place for bodies —— in a word, to the *sepulcher* in which he had been entombed. (See as already quoted.) In each of the other instances alluded to, *ek* is the word employed, referring not to the *abode* of the dead, but simply to the dead themselves, as a company contrasted with the dwellers upon earth. From this *company* he arose, that is, "from among," those who had died.

The Greek noun ἅδης = *hades* (or haides or simply ades)—, usually rendered "hell," though not the only word so rendered, — being derived from *a*, the Greek particle of privation or negation, and

*idein*, an infinitive form of *eido*, to see, imports, of course, something *not seen*. It is hence appropriately used as a name for the state or condition of *the dead*, they being naturally invisible to physical sight from their lack of physical bodies.

Note. In the heathen poets, in Josephus, and and in the works of various ancient writers, hades imports the *place* or *abode* of the dead; but it has not this sense in the New Testament, except by a figure of speech, as will appear presently.

Hades occurs in the New Testament eleven times. In the Common Version it is once rendered "grave;" in the other instances "hell."

Hades is used in connection with some kind of resurrection, seven times in the New Testament. Thus Paul employs it once; (rendered "grave;") Peter, in his sermon at the day of Pentecost, quotes it once, and uses it once; it occurs once in the parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus, and twice in the judgment described in Revelations 20th; and it is in the Revelations also, where the glorified Redeemer declares, "I am He who liveth, and was dead; and, behold, I am alive for evermore, Amen; and have the keys of hell and of death." [1]

In the Parable above mentioned, hades is used as if really the name of a *place*, in like manner as the corresponding Hebrew word is employed in certain highly figurative portions of the Old Testament. (See as referred to below. [2]) But in the other instances alluded to in the New Testament, it is evident hades is a name for a state or condition. Thus,

When Peter, on the day of Pentecost, quoted from the 16th Psalm, "Thou wilt not leave my

[1] Cor. xv. 55; Acts ii. 27, 31; Luke xvi. 23: Rev. xx. 13, 14; i. 18.
[2] Isa. xiv. 9, 15; Ezek. xxxi. 16, 17; xxxii. 21, 27: Deut. xxxii. 22; Jonah ii. 2.

soul [, that is, "me,"] in hell," &c., and applied it to "the resurrection of Christ, that His soul [, meaning "that He,"] was not left in hell, neither his flesh did see corruption," the apostle evidently referred to the facts that our Lord did not long remain in the condition of invisibility common to the dead, but on the third day appeared again among mortals, and was seen by the physical eye although He was truly *im*mortal, having thus come out, as it were, from among the dead before his body was attacked by putrefaction.

I do not deny that the dead are in some place. I do not deny that Christ was in some place while in the invisible state. Perhaps during that period he visited several places. A little before his departure, he certainly anticipated being that very day "in Paradise," which certainly seems to be a place, and to be at least analogous to "the third heaven," if not identical with it. It is the opinion also of sundry expositors, that between Friday afternoon and Sunday morning He personally literally "*went* and preached to the spirits in prison,"[1] which last term seems indicative of a locality somewhat diverse from those just mentioned. But I do deny that *hades*, in the Scriptures, except by a rhetorical figure, signifies either "the place of the dead," as affirmed by some of the more liberal critics, or "the place of departed spirits," as taught in the Book of Common Prayer. I contend that hades properly imports an invisible *state* or condition; and that this term is used for the state of the dead from the circumstance of their being naturally invisible to us.

That hades, in the Scriptures, does *not* properly signify a *place*, is clearly evinced by its being, in several instances, coupled with *death*, which term

[1] Luke xxiii. 43; 2 Cor. xii. 1–4; 1 Peter iii. 18–20.

is undeniably expressive of a state or condition. Thus Jesus claims to have "the *keys* of hades;" yet hades is not thereby shown to be a place; for His affirmation is, "I ..... have the keys of hades *and of death*." If hades is a place, then so is death; but the term death, as here used, *indisputably* imports a condition. At the figurative judgment set forth in Rev. 20th, "death and hades delivered up the dead which were in them," and afterward "death and hades were cast into the lake of fire," which shows that hades is a name for a condition as much as is death. So, in vision, death was seen *riding* forth "on a pale horse," "and hades followed with him";— one condition or state of things being closely followed by an other condition or state.

Corresponding to *hades*, in the mere etymological sense of that noun, as something that is not seen, is the adjective αιδιος = *aidios*, which occurs in two texts, and is rendered in the one "eternal," and in the other, "everlasting":

"For the invisible things of Him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even His eternal (aidios) power and Godhead." Rom. 1. 20.

"And the angels who kept not their first estate, ..... he hath reserved in everlasting (aidios) chains under darkness, to the judgment of the great day." Jude 6.

Aidios is commonly taken to be derived from *aei*, always; and so has been rendered as above. *Outside of the New Testament*, it perhaps *has* a sense corresponding to such a derivation; but I am convinced that *in* the New Testament, its true sense is such as it would naturally have were it derived from the same that hades is — in other words, that in the two texts above quoted *aidios* has the sense of "unseen."

What could be more natural than the sense indicated by the following rendering of the text from Romans, the members of the sentence being so arranged as to exhibit the *parallelism* common in Jewish writings?

"For the Invisible things of Him,
[Even] His unseen Power and Godhood,
Are clearly perceived
From the creation of the world,
Being understood
By the things that are made."

That the word *aidios* has the sense of "unseen" in also the text from Jude, would perhaps be out of sight were we obliged to consider the text by itself; and yet its language is really *suggestive* of that very sense. But let the text be taken in connection with the words of Paul above quoted, as also with those of Peter in a text thought to be parallel with this from Jude, and the sense of the word in question must be clearly seen to be "unseen," and nothing less. The angels or messengers mentioned being enchained in or under "darkness," their chains, whatever their nature, must, of course, be "unseen chains;" and in 2 Peter ii. 4, the angels or messengers mentioned are represented as being bound with "chains OF darkness"; and would not such chains be necessarily "unseen"?

For some remarks on "the judgment" in certain texts, see Chapters xv., xvi., xvii. For somewhat concerning evil angels, see Chapter xxiii.

The risings *from* the dead mentioned in the Scriptures, were all of them to a state of *mortality* excepting that of Christ alone. Thus,

The brother of Martha and Mary was by our Lord truly raised from the dead into this mortal state again, with doubtless the same liability to die as formerly. The like may be said of the widow's

son at Nain; of Tabitha, whom Peter raised at Joppa; and of several others. Of this character also, most probably, in the opinions of "the people," and of Herod likewise, was the supposed resurrection of the Baptist in the person of Christ. But as regards Christ himself, we are scripturally assured that He, "being raised from the dead, [properly, "having been raised,"] dieth no more; death hath no more dominion over Him." That is to say, He is undying and immortal. (Rom. vi. 9. See also Acts xiii. 30–37.)

It has been denied that the body of Christ was really devoid of life when and while entombed. Also,

It has been denied that our Lord actually arose in his earthly body.

As to the first of these denials, it is indeed true that Jesus declared with express reference to his own life, "No man taketh it from Me"; yet it is not less true that He continued the sentence with "*but I lay it down of Myself.*" And he adds, "I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it [up] again." What life was it which He had power to lay down, and which he actually did lay down, if it was not the life of his physical organization?

In regard to the second denial, I observe that that life which he had power to lay down as above stated, was clearly the very life which He had power also to take up again. And did He not exercise this power in the latter case as well as in the former? Listen to Him once more: "Herein doth my Father love me, because I lay down my life *that I might take it again.*" [1] If, now, he did not take it up a second time, as he said he had power to do, the express object of His laying it down



[1] John x. 15, 18.

in preference to having it forced from Him, was evidently not accomplished. I affirm, then, that, according to the Scriptures,

Jesus Christ truly laid down, or relinquished, the life of His earthly body, and as truly took up again, or resumed, the life of that same body. Not, however, that He had not celestial life also. See chap. xxxv.

The Greek noun απαρχη = *aparche*, usually rendered "first-fruits," may be properly so rendered when used in relation to *sacrifices;* yet when so used, the word is more commonly put in the plural number, *aparchai.* In the New Testament, however, it is always singular, as *aparche*, and has the simple sense of *sample* or specimen. Thus the text which speaks of Christ as having "risen from the dead, and become the first-fruits of those that slept," is rightly, "Christ has been raised from among the dead, a sample of those having slept." 1 Cor. xv. 20.

In accordance with the foregoing remarks is the following definition:

The resurrection of a deceased person *from the dead*, whether, as in the case of Jesus, to an immortal state, or, as in all other cases, to mere mortal life, is, specifically, his being put in possession of an organization differing in such manner from the organizations of others who have died, as that his presence is naturally perceptible by means of the physical senses. This state of things has existed in a few instances, and has been brought about by the riser's being invested or (, in the case of Jesus,) *super*invested with an earthly body, — always the one previously inhabited. The subject having thus *emerged* —, so to speak, — from the state of invisibility common to those who have died, is therefore very naturally

represented as having come out or arisen from among the dead.

N. B. — In the original of the phrase "from the dead," when such phrase is not connected with a verb of motion, the preposition *ek* sometimes seems to mark a selection from among either the physically or the morally dead having relation to excellence, and so to import either "of" or "among." Thus Col. i. 18, and Rom. vi. 13, *may* import "the first-born [or 'Chief One'] *of* the dead;" and "those who are alive *among* the dead."

## CHAPTER IV.

### SCRIPTURAL DEFINITIONS — CONTINUED.

THE bodily organization or organism proper to the future life, the Apostle Paul denominates "a spiritual body," in contradistinction from the organism proper to the present life, which the Common Version makes him call "a natural body."

We are told in Genesis, that Adam, being formed "of the dust of the ground," and having received from his Maker "the breath of life," "became a living [or animate] soul," which, in that place, is the same as to say a living creature or animal, since the description there given has manifest reference to man's physical structure. Referring to that account, the apostle tells us that Adam "was made a living soul," but that Christ has become "a quickening spirit." He uses the text from Genesis to illustrate, in part, the fact which himself sets forth, that there are two kinds of human bodies, the one kind proper to this mode of being, the other, to the hereafter life.

"So .... is the resurrection of the dead. ..... It is sown a natural [*or* animal] body; it is raised a spiritual body. There is a natural body, and there is a spiritual body. And so it is written, The first man Adam was made a living soul; the last Adam was made a quickening spirit. .... The first man is [*or* was] of the earth, earthy; the second man is the Lord from heaven.... And as we have borne the image of the earthy, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly." 1 Cor. xv. 42–49.

In the above-quoted passage, the adjectives rendered "natural" and "spiritual," are derived, respectively, from the words rendered "soul" and "spirit" — *psuchikos*, from *psuche* in the sense of living creature or animal, and *pneumatikos*, from *pneuma* in the sense of spirit or spiritual being. Christ, the heavenly or celestial man, being styled a quickening, enlivening, or vivifying *spirit*, it is entirely proper that the resurrectional body should be styled a *spiritual* or celestial one, that is, such a body as He has — for are we not to bear his image? In like manner, seeing that the first man was constituted an animal being by receiving such a body as animals have, it is also entirely proper that the earthly body should be styled an *animal* one — for do we not bear the image of Adam? It is easy to see that if "spiritual" is a good rendering in the one case, "natural" is *not* a good rendering in the other; for the terms used by the apostle are by him placed in *contrast;* and surely a spiritual body is not necessarily an *un*natural one.

From the foregoing considerations result the following definitions:

The *natural or animal* body mentioned by the apostle, is styled thus — not with reference to its constituent elements, but — from the circumstance of its being the kind of body seen in nature, or, in other words, such a body as animals have.

The *spiritual or celestial* body which the apostle mentions, is so styled — not to indicate that it is composed of spirit, but — from its being such a kind of body as spirits celestial have, especially such a one as He has who is denominated "a quickening spirit."

The verb ζωοποιεω = *zoöpoieo*, from the verb *poieo*, to make, and either *zoön*, a living creature, or *zoös*, alive, is usually rendered "quicken;" as in the

text, "For as the Father raiseth up the dead, and quickeneth them, even so the Son quickeneth whom he will."[1] The primary idea expressed by this word seems clearly to be — not the giving of life to inanimate, unorganized objects, but — either the arousing of the life-principle into action, as in cases of suspended animation, — or the development of a higher from a lower grade of life, as in the production of worms from the *zoösperms* or life-germs in the eggs of insects.

Note. Paul applies this word to the springing of a plant from a seed: "That which thou sowest is not quickened except it die."[2]

When applied to the hereafter state, the word rendered "quicken" seems to have reference to the celestial organism. As, in the beginning, "the LORD God formed man of the dust of the ground, *and* breathed into his nostrils the breath of life;" that is, gave man an earthly body *and* inspired, that body with earthly life; — so, also, "the Father raiseth up the dead, *and* quickeneth them; that is, HE gives them celestial bodies, *and* enlivens or vivifies the same with celestial life.

In the *passive* form, the word zoöpoieo, usually rendered "quicken," is, in one text, rendered according to its etymology, "made alive;" "As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." (1 Cor. xv. 52.)

As used in a religious sense, and applied to persons in this mode of being, the quickening process intended by the verb in mention seems clearly to be the imparting of spiritual or religious *life* — concerning which life, see chapters vi. xiii.

The common rendering of various Greek terms now about to be given, with their proper sense in the New Testament, is as follows:

[1] John v. 21. [2] 1 Cor. xv. 36.

PHTHARTOS, "corruptible;" liable to physical corruption or decay. Rom. i. 23; 1 Cor. ix. 25; xv. 53, 54; 1 Peter i. 23, &c.

THNETOS, mostly "mortal;" liable to physical death. Rom. vi. 12; viii. 11; 2 Cor. iv. 11.

PHTHORA and DIAPHTHORA, mostly "corruption;" the state or condition of being corrupted, either physically or morally. But in those three texts where direct reference is had to the attributes of the animal body, as *contrasted* with those of the spiritual, *phthora* plainly imports — *not* "corruption," but — "corruptibility;" the quality of being liable to physical decay. Rom. viii. 21; 1 Cor. xv. 42, 50.

To THNETON. (1.) "Mortality;" (literally, "the mortal;") the attribute or state of liability to physical death. 2 Cor. v. 4. (2.) "Mortal." 1 Cor. xv. 53, 54. See last chapter of this work.

APHTHARTOS. (1.) "Incorruptible;" not liable to physical decay. Rom. i. 23; 1 Cor. ix. 25; xv. 52; 1 Peter i. 4, 23. (2.) "Immortal;" not liable to physical death. 1 Tim. i. 17.

(ATHANATOS. "Immortal." This word not used in the New Testament. Aphthartos supposed to be sometimes used instead, or once, at least, as above, where Athanatos is said to occur in some copies.)

APHTHARSIA. This word occurs seven or more times in the New Testament, and is four times rendered "incorruption;" the condition of not being physically corrupted; and twice rendered "immortality;" the attribute or the state of non-liability to physical death. 1 Cor. xv. 42, 50, 53, 54; 2 Tim. i. 10; Rom. ii. 7.

The first style of rendering in the texts just referred to is clearly *deficient;* the last is almost certainly *incorrect* as to one of the instances. Thus,

When aphtharsia is used in its primary or literal sense, it indicates — not merely the *condition* naturally signified by the term "incorruption," but — the condition or quality properly signified by "incorruptibility;" the attribute or the state of nonliability to physical corruption or decay. In the text, "This corruptible must put on incorruption, (aphtharsia,) and this mortal must put on immortality (athanasia,) it is scarcely possible to avoid seeing that *incorruption* bears not the same relation to corruptible, that *immortality* does to mortal. The proper rendering of aphtharsia, here, is manifestly "incorruptibility;" as, "This corruptible must put on incorruptibility." And *perhaps* this is true in one of the texts where it is rendered "immortality:" "And hath brought life and aphtharsia to light." (2 Tim. i. 10.)

In the other text where the word in mention is rendered "immortality," it is well-nigh certain that the Greek term is used *metaphorically*, denoting the state or condition of being free from corruption in a *moral* sense. We are told that God will render eternal or spiritual life to those who properly "seek for glory, honor, and *aphtharsia*." (Rom. ii. 7.) "Incorruptness," or freedom from moral defilement, is almost certainly the idea here, in which case the passage is a commentary upon the text, "Blessed [or rather "happy"] are the pure in heart." (Matt. v. 8.) Aphtharsia, in this secondary sense, is synonymous with *aphthoria;* and this is at least closely allied to *adiaphthoria*, the word rendered "uncorruptness" in Titus ii. 7. (Note. Aphthoria is said to occur here in some MSS.)

In Ephesians, last verse, aphtharsia is rendered "sincerity." The Received Text of the Greek has it also in Titus ii. 7 — rendered in the same manner.

ATHANASIA. This word in the New Testament is properly rendered "immortality"; the attribute or the state of non-liability to physical death. 1 Cor. xv. 53, 54; 1 Tim. vi. 16.

It is proper to observe, here, that, in their application to man in the hereafter life, both aphtharsia and athanasia have reference solely to *bodily* organization. In other words, that of which incorruptibility and immortality are affirmed, is — not the spirit, but — the spiritual body. That the spirit or soul of man is, or is to be, either incorruptible, or immortal, the Scripture writers no where either assert or deny.

AKATALUTOS. This word is once used in the New Testament, and is applied to the *life* of Christ in his risen state. It is commonly rendered "endless": "After the power of an endless life." Heb. vii. 16. The word is literally "indissoluble",—from *a*, not, and *kataluo*, to dissolve. And the noun *zoë*, here rendered "life," seems, in this place, to have the sense of a mode or manner of existence, and so to relate to our Saviour's celestial organism, or "glorious *body*," as being incapable of dissolution. Note. Paul, in one place, speaks of the earthly body as being a "tabernacle," or temporary fabric, liable to be — as he expresses it — "dissolved." (2 Cor. v. 1.) But the spiritual organism, being incorruptible and immortal, can have no such liability. It is "indissoluble."

The resurrectional body being incorruptible, must exist not merely in a state or condition of incorruption, but must of course possess also the attribute of incorruptibility. It therefore is free not only from disease, but from any *tendency* in that direction. No functional derangement can ever occur; no abnormal nor morbid condition ever be

present; no part of the organism ever take on any other than a healthful action; — and a recuperative power must inhere therein fully equal to all the waste and wear incident to spirit life and activity. Hence, whatever may have been our hygienic condition in the present life, it must be entirely certain that in the hereafter life we shall come to be in the possession of perfect and uninterrupted bodily health.

But incorruptibility, though much, is by no means *all* that the Scriptures teach in regard to the perfection of the celestial organism. The spiritual body is perpetually *undying*, each subject of the resurrection being as He is who, "having been raised, . . . . dieth no more." Nor is this all. Being possessed of the attribute of immortality, the spiritual body must necessarily be immortal;— must be free not merely from death, but —, under God,— from all liability to such an event; — and its recuperative powers must be proof in perfection not only against what we might call natural decay, but also against all properly supposable violence. To beings thus organized, the words of the infallible Teacher apply with their entire force,— dependence upon God always recognized,—"Neither can they die any more."[1]

With an eye to the author's particular views, it may now be objected that though the foregoing description is perhaps true, prospectively, it can not be true of any earth-born beings as yet, nor, indeed, as yet, of any created being whatever; for that, according to an express declaration of the apostle, God "only hath immortality." It is hence argued that, at present, the Divine Being is the only immortal being in the entire universe.

[1] Luke xx. 36.

To such an objection, as founded on this text, I object in turn, proposing however, to keep within the limits of the human race.

1. To understand Paul as here teaching that no other being than God is immortal, is clearly to make him contradict himself; for he certainly asserts, as a perfectly reliable fact, that "Jesus Christ, of the seed [*or* posterity] of David, was raised from the dead;" as also, that He, "being raised from the dead, [rightly, "having been raised,"] dieth no more; death hath no more dominion over Him."[1] What less is here affirmed than that "the man Christ Jesus" is not only undying, but is also immortal?

2. In the immediate context of the text in hand, it is just as much affirmed that God is the only ruler in the universe possessed of any *power*, as it is that He only is immortal: "Who is the blessed and *only* Potentate, the King of kings, and Lord of lords; who *only* hath immortality," &c.[2]

A potentate is a powerful king or ruler. But it certainly can not have been Paul's meaning here, that those kings of whom God is *the* King, have no power or potency whatever; nor can he have intended to affirm that some of them may not have even great power compared with some others. And, to me, the sentiment of the apostle is, that God's power is *one-like* or unique. Note. It appears that the English word "only" was originally *onely*, which is to say one-like; and that, when used adverbially, it was a simple adverb of *manner*, belonging to a large class of words ending in *ly;* as wisely, briefly, truly.

The uniqueness or oneliness of God's potency or power, seems to consist, to a great extent, in

[1] 2 Tim. ii. 8; Rom. vi. 9. [2] 1 Tim. vi. 15, 16.

this: His power is underived from any other being or beings; while that of all other beings is derived from HIM as the originative Source of power. The apostle elsewhere says, and with express reference to governmental power, "There is no power but of God; the powers that are are ordained of God." So when Jesus claimed plenary power for the accomplishment of His work, he said, "All power is *given* to me," which is manifestly acknowledging that even *His* power was not from Himself.[1]

As with God's potency, so with his immortalness, its uniqueness or oneliness consists in at least the fact that His immortality is underived. All other immortals are so by His power, while HIS immortality is from Himself. Of *Jesus* even, it is affirmed that "GOD raised him from the dead"; and not merely this, but also in regard to his *continued* existence in the heavenly state, it is declared expressly, "He liveth by the power of God."[2]

In what other respects, or whether in any other, the immortality of the Uncreated One is specifically unique, or differs from that of any created being, is a subject which I shall not now discuss. I will however suggest that it almost certainly differs also from ours in not having reference to bodily organization.

In the passage which speaks of God's immortality, the word "only" is first an adjective, then an adverb. The same is true of the Greek word *monos*, there rendered "only." Probably this word was once a fair rendering of *monos* in that text; but now, since its "only" sense, as an adjective, or as an adverb, is an exclusive and *non*-comparative one, the substitution of an other word or words seems to have become not "only" proper, but actually necessary.

[1] Rom. xiii. 1; Matt. xxviii. 18. [2] Acts xiii. 30; 2 Cor. xiii. 4.

I translate the passage thus:

"The blessed and unique Potentate, the King of kings, and Lord of lords; the One having immortality uniquely, dwelling in light inaccessible," &c.

In a certain Scripture wherein is professedly given an express revealment of the fact of the ultimate cessation of human mortality,

The verb *to be changed* (, Greek *allassomai*, from *allasso*, to change, or to exchange,) has, in two texts, *a special sense.* The change is thus announced and described, according to the Common Version:

"Now this I say, brethren, that flesh and blood can not inherit the kingdom of God; neither doth corruption inherit incorruption. Behold, I show you a mystery: We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump: for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed. For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality. So when this corruptible shall have put on," &c. 1 Cor. xv. 50–54.

From this passage, taken in connection with others, it appears to be a Scripture doctrine that at "the end" of Christ's reign, all who shall be then alive on the earth, will, in an instant of time, become incorruptible and immortal without dying,* that is, in the proper sense of that term, which supposes the corporeal system to have either suffered violence, or to have been diseased, or to be worn out. And this leads to an other remark, which may, perhaps, as well be introduced here as elsewhere, namely, that

If it could be proved — but how can it be? — that as the spiritual body succeeds the animal one, so a more-than spiritual body will succeed the spiritual, and that be succeeded by one of a higher and more advanced grade, and so on, even above

* See last chapter of this work.

and beyond the over-extra-ultra-hyper-super-preter-transcendental spiritual, such proving would by no means invalidate the Scripture doctrine of immortality, that is, of non-liability to death. The actual occurrence of the series of changes supposed, would not necessarily involve the presence of the wearing-out process, nor of destructive violence, nor of deadly disease.

The following definitions are designed to be illustrative of the text, "The Father raises the dead, and quickens them:"

The resurrection of the dead into the after-death life, — which is to say their rising and their being raised into that life, — is, specifically, their being invested with bodies proper to that mode of life. the new embodiment arises, by the appointment of God, from the unfoldment of a spiritual germ —, so to speak, — infixed in the constitution of man's nature.

The *quickening* of the physically dead, as also of those having undergone a change equivalent to physical death, seems to be the imparting of spiritual or celestial life to the super-earthly organization.

Note. From the words of the Saviour relative to the Father's raising and quickening the dead, it seems unquestionable that the *quickening* process, as applicable to the hereafter life, always accompanies (or follows) the raising of a human being into that life; and — no doubt — the same or a similar process *will* accompany (or follow) the *change* which the Scriptures reveal as being to take place in "the end" of Christ's reign on the earth. But the Scriptures, in speaking of our transition to the hereafter life, do not always mention our being quickened. That seems to be considered as necessarily and unmistakeably implied.

## CHAPTER V.

### SCRIPTURAL DEFINITIONS — CONTINUED.

From various considerations I induce the conclusion that the resurrection, in the Scriptural or true Christian sense, — or rather that actuality of which rising is a figure, — is an indispensable, invariable preliminary to the after-death life. Thus, from what was said to Moses at the burning bush, Jesus claims to prove, scripturally, that "the dead are raised." But he proves their resurrection only by proving that the so-called dead are really "living;" and having done this, he offers no further evidence. (See Luke xx. 37, 38, and the parallel passages.)

In Paul's first letter to the church at Corinth, the apostle, arguing against some in that church who said that "there is no resurrection of the dead," specifies certain consequences which would result from the fact —, if fact it were, — "that the dead rise not;" and among the consequences stated by him is the following: "Then those also who are fallen asleep in Christ are perished." It seems scarcely possible to avoid seeing that this text teaches, by *implication*, that the resurrection, or an equivalent process, is actually indispensable to future existence. The little word "also," as employed in this text, is clearly a term of great and grave import, it having reference to the hypotheti-

cal fact *implied* in the sequence, "your faith is vain; ye are yet in your sins."

The passage containing the text alluded to, when more properly translated as to the *tenses*, reads thus:

"If the dead are not raised, then Christ has not been raised. And if Christ has not been raised, your faith is vain; you are yet in your sins. Then those also have perished who have fallen asleep in Christ." 1 Cor. xv. 16–18.

In the commencement of the chapter, the apostle announces that he is declaring the *gospel* which they had received, and by which, says he, "ye *are saved*, . . . . unless ye have believed *in vain*." And his afterward telling them that upon the hypothesis assumed their faith was vain, &c., is, to me, as if he had said, "You have believed in Christ, but then He died long ago; and if there is no resurrection, he perished at death. And if he has perished, there is no Saviour; and if there is no Saviour, you, of course, are not saved, and your faith is utterly valueless."

If in the passage in hand, the apostle did *not* intend to give the idea, "If the dead are not raised then Christ has perished, why did he add, "then those *also* have perished who have fallen asleep in Christ?" And what is all this but arguing plainly and unequivocally that if there is no resurrection there is no after-death life?

If it shall be asked *why* the future life is thus as it were dependent on the resurrection, the writer of this will only say, Because our Father thought proper to have it so. Nor should the reader be surprised at this answer, since it is substantially the only one which an enlightened philosophy can give in regard to the reason of some of the commonest facts in nature. Matthew xi. 26, has an extensive appliancy.

The word rendered "gospel" is *euaggelion*, which has been Latinized in *evangelium*, from which comes evangel, and hence evangelism, evangelist, &c. The primary import of the original word is good news, which fact is very generally recognized; but the usual *application* of the word in the New Testament is as generally overlooked. The term is sometimes a name for Christianity considered as a system of truth; (see chap. ix. of this work;) but it is mostly applied to the History of Christ. (See chap. xxxi.) The narrow acceptation and use of it, in modern times, as a synonym for this or that "evangelical system," — so called, — is without scriptural authority or precedent, excepting so far as the one or the other or both may be deduced from what is said of some in the early times, by whose efforts —, as we learn from the apostle, — the Galatian Christians were, for awhile, carried away "to an other gospel; which —, says he, — "is not an other; but" —, he continues, — "there are some who trouble you, and would pervert the gospel of Christ." [1]

The phrase "in Christ" has several significations. Thus, being *in Christ* sometimes imports being a Christian, that is, a believer in Christ; as in the remark of Paul concerning himself, "I knew a man in Christ about fourteen years ago," &c.; also his remark concerning certain brethren, — "who were in Christ before me." It also signifies "through the agency of Christ;" as where the apostle announces that it is God's *will* "to gather together in one all things in Christ." [2] In this work, however, we are not particularly interested as to the sense of this phrase excepting only in

[1] Gal. i. 6, 7. [2] 2 Cor. xii. 2; Rom. xvi. 7; Eph. i. 10.

texts having *direct* reference to the future life, — of which texts the following are the principal, if not the only ones:

"For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive," (or "quickened.") 1 Cor. xv. 22.

"And the dead in Christ shall rise first." (Literally, "shall be raised first," or, "shall have been raised first.") 1 Thess. iv. 16.

I am convinced that the two texts just quoted belong to the same class, in that the phrase "in Christ," in the latter text, qualifies the *raising* mentioned, instead of the implied dying; and hence that, in English, the proper arrangement of the words in the latter text is, "The dead shall have been raised in Christ first;" or "The dead shall previously been raised in Christ."

In the former of the texts in hand, (and why not also in the latter?) the true import of the phrase "in Christ" must be intimately related to that of the phrase "in Adam;" and in each phrase the preposition "in" evidently points out a relation not ususally indicated by that word. May it not be expressive of some appointed connection, like as in the text where we read that God said to Abraham, "In Isaac shall thy seed [*or* descendants] be called?" Or, at the least, may it not be that the Greek phrases "*en to Adam*," "*en to Christo*," = in Adam, in Christ, are *elleptical*,—and that some word expressive of connection is to be understood in each, making the sense to be "in connection with Adam," "in connection with Christ," as in the following renderings:

"For even as all die in connection with Adam, so, also, shall all be quickened in connection with Christ."

"But the dead shall previously have been raised in connection with Christ."

It was said to our common progenitor, "Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return." This was a law of his nature, applicable of course, to his descendants also; and hence the Scripture remark, "For we must needs die." Thus are we connected with Adam in *dying;* and as to connection with Christ in being *quickened,* was He not "quickened in spirit" on being "put to death in flesh?" And has He not been "*raised* from among the dead, a specimen of those having slept?"[1] Note. "Put to death in flesh, yet quickened in spirit," and "raised from among," &c., are literal renderings of the texts here alluded to.

From various passages of Scripture, I gather that the resurrectional organism, in a rudimental state, and more or less developed according to our measure of spirituality, — or, at any rate, that the *germ* of that organism, non-germinant, may be, in some, — is actually contained within our animal bodies. Thus,

The Apostle Paul speaks of "the outward man" and "the inward," saying, "Though our outward man perish, yet the inward man is renewed day by day." And I consider it certain that, *in this text,* "the inward man" is analogous to the outward—— not the spirit, but its inner envelopment, or the spiritual organism, even as the outward man is the spirit's outer envelopment, or the animal organism. For in the same connection, speaking of the earthly body, and representing it as a tabernacle, or temporary dwelling, he declares, substantially, "We know that if this house were dissolved, we have an other." And this averment is preceded by the remark, "We look not at the things which are *seen,* but at the things which are not seen."[2]

[1] Gen. iii. 19; 2 Sam. xiv. 14; 1 Pet. iii. 18; 1 Cor. xv. 20.
[2] 2 Cor. iv. 16; v. 1.

In an other place he represents the celestial body as in the particular condition of being about to be *born* of the earthly body:

"We know that the whole creation groaneth and *travaileth* in pain..... And not only they, but ourselves also, who have the first-fruits of the spirit, .... groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption [or 'the release'] of our body." Rom. viii. 22, 23.

We see from the above, or may see, that as the body of the *fetus* is inclosed within the body of the prospective mother, and in due time enters upon a separate existence, in connection with its inhabiting spirit and all its appurtenances,—so, according to the Scriptures, the spiritual body, with its spiritual inhabitant, in the case of true Christians at least, is, at death, disengaged from the animal organism, and enters upon a separate and new mode of being. The apostle's metaphor *may*, in these days, be deemed indelicate; — what seems proper enough in one age, and among a certain people, may seem quite the reverse in an other age, and among an other people; — yet, whether so deemed, or not, and whether it so is, or not, its lesson of truth is so glaringly apparent as to be positively unmistakable; and his employing such an illustration should probably be regarded by us as a most fortunate circumstance, if not a providential one.

In that passage wherein the apostle tells of his earnest and painful desire for the immortal life, he more than intimates that we were made with express reference to such a life. Says he, "For we who are in this tabernacle do groan, being burdened; not for that we would be unclothed, but clothed upon, that mortality might be swallowed up by life." And his next words are, "Now He who hath wrought us for the self-same thing, is

God."[1] "Wrought." That is, made, or fitted. Is it not then a Scripture doctrine that man is constitutionally adapted to a state of immortality?

The existence, in at least some persons, of a spiritual organization within the earthly organism, is pretty clearly indicated by the existence of a spiritual sight and hearing, as manifested in the case of Stephen, of John the Revelator, of Elisha's servant, of the Apostle Peter, and others?[2] As physical sight and hearing are effected through the organs of the animal body, so spiritual sight and hearing must —, it would seem, — be effected through the eyes and ears —, so to speak, — of the spiritual body.

What sane person supposes that even the most intelligent of mere animals —, as dogs, horses, elephants, — long for, or expect, or even cogitate upon, an after-death state of being! And what reason have we to suppose that *man* (, whom some one has described as an animal of the genus *homo*,) would ever have *thought* of an other life, had not its germ within him generated the idea?

The future-life thought is manifestly the offspring — not of intellect, but — of sentiment. And in the estimation of the writer of this, a principal reason why some persons, near the close of this earthly life, have so clearly realized, and so confidently anticipated, an other and higher life, has been — not so much their *intellectual* activity, as — the progressed unfoldment within them of the germ of such higher life. If the reader "will receive it," — to adopt the Saviour's language, — some such persons have seemed (, to the discerning eye,) as if to an extent transfigured.

[1] 2 Cor. v. 2–5.

[2] Acts vii. 55, 56; Rev. i. 10–17; 2 Kings vi. 17; Acts x. 9–15; 2 Cor. xii. 1–4.

## CHAPTER VI.

### SCRIPTURAL DEFINITIONS—CONTINUED.

THE Greek noun αιων = *aion* is variously rendered in the Common Version, but mostly "world" and "ever," as in the phrases, "this world," "the end of the world," "for ever," "for ever and ever," &c. When aion is rendered "ever," but especially when the phrase "for ever and ever" is used, it is commonly supposed to signify duration without end. Whether it has or has not this sense in some texts, is a question the discussion of which, to any great extent, can hardly be considered as belonging to this work. In certain texts it plainly imports *age;* as for example, in that one where the object of GOD in certain acts mentioned is set forth to be, "that in the ages [, *or* in the *aions*,*] to come He might show the exceeding riches of his grace . . . . . through Christ Jesus;" —— also, where we read concerning *Christ*, that "now once in the end of the *aions** hath he appeared to put away sin."[1] In the former of these texts *aion* in the plural is rightly, and of course properly, rendered "ages"; in the latter it is wrongly, and therefore improperly, rendered "world." Query. If in this last text aion has really a *mundane* sense, why not render it in the *plural* — "worlds"?

* Aion pluralized *Englishly*. [1] Eph. ii. 7; Heb. ix. 26.

In the Epistle to the Hebrews, *aion* is repeatedly used in connection with the priestly office of Christ, and is rendered "ever" and "evermore." At first view, the word seems, in those texts, to have an endless sense; yet it is certain that the extent of duration there indicated by *aion*, though far-reaching, is far from endless, it being limited by the limited duration of Christ's priestship.

In the above-mentioned Epistle, Jesus is said to have been "made a high-priest *for ever* after the order of Melchisedec"; — the text from the Psalms, "Thou art a priest" &c., alluded to in the above text, is quoted a number of times; — it is declared that Christ "is consecrated *for evermore*;" — and that He, "because he continueth *ever*, hath an unchangeable priesthood," or, according to the marginal rendering, "hath a priesthood which passeth not from one to another."[1] In all these texts, so far as found in the New Testament, *aion* occurs in a phrase which, as there used, imports *for* or *throughout*, or *during* the age — εις τον αιωνα = *eis ton aiona*. (Aion in an oblique *case*, the *article* in the same case, and the *preposition* eis.) Note. In several texts occurring elsewhere, this phrase seems to have no particular reference to time. See Chap. xix.

The Greek proposition *eis*, when it has relation to *time*, may be thus defined: When it relates to any particular *point* of time, it has the sense of "to" or "until" that time; where it relates to some *space* of time, it imports "for," or "throughout," or "during" the whole period. When not relating to time, it signifies "to," "into," "in," &c.

We see, then, that Christ is "consecrated" or

[1] Heb. vi. 20; v. 6; vii. 17, 21, 24, 28; Ps. cx. 4.

"made a high-priest *for the age*"; and that He, "because He continues" a priest "*throughout the age*, has an unpassing priesthood." What age is here meant? What, other than the Christian age, — so to speak, — comprising the whole period of Christ's reign? Being possessed of "an indissoluble life", as we have seen in a previous chapter, he is to hold the above-mentioned office throughout the entire term of time during which that office is to continue. But at "the *end*, when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God," will not his mediatorship cease, and of course also his priestship?

Aion —, as has been before intimated,—is not always expressive of duration at all. Certainly in one text, probably in more, it literally denotes *a Spiritual Being*, real or fictitious, which fact in the one text alluded to, is evinced by the use of the words "Prince" and "Spirit" directly after Aion, as if in explanation:

> "And you hath He quickened, who were dead in trespasses and sins; wherein, in time past, ye walked, according to the Aion of this world, according to the Prince of the power of the air, the Spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience." Eph. ii. 1, 2.

In this text the word *aion* is translated "course" "According to the *course* of this world." Had the word been left untranslated, or been merely Latinized into Æon, the apostle's idea would have been left scarcely any more obscure than it is by this translation. "Genius" would probably come as near the sense of the original as any word that can be used in English, "According to the *genius* of this world." For it is known that

Some of the ancients recognized the existence of Æons or Eons, a species of beings similar in some respects to the *Genii* of the Arabian Tales.

To these most likely the apostle here alludes; but his alluding thus to the Eons does not go to show that he believed in the existence of just *such* beings, any more than the declaration, "Ye can not serve God and Mammon," shows that the Saviour recognized the heathen god of Riches as a veritable entity.

In an other place, where we are instructed that angels are "ministering [*or* officially-serving] spirits," even as our Lord Jesus Christ is elsewhere declared to be "a quickening [*or* vivifying] Spirit;" — and where also we learn that in official dignity *He* is preëminently *superior* to angelic spirits; — the subject is introduced by the declaration that GOD hath "spoken to us by HIS Son, whom he hath appointed heir of all things, by whom also he made the Aions."[1] Jesus being here set forth as the universal HEIR, in a Regal or kingly sense, in which sense intelligent, and even spiritual beings, can be inherited by Him, *as subjects*, I consider it at least probable that the common rendering, "by whom", should be changed to "for whom: "For whom also He made [or "constituted"] the aions." In this text, *aion* in the plural is commonly rendered "worlds;" yet I am quite of the opinion that it imports neither worlds nor ages, but bona fide spiritual beings; and that it should be understood to mean angels.

In at least one passage, *aion* signifies *life*, in the sense of a mode or manner of existence. Thus our Lord, when asked what matrimonial arrangement in a certain presented case would be proper "in the resurrection," replied that "the children of *this aion* marry," but that those obtaining "*that aion* and the resurrection" do not.[2] Here, "this

[1] Heb. i. 1, 2. [2] Luke xx. 24, 25.

aion" and "that aion" are manifestly *this life*, or our present mode of being, and *that life*, or the hereafter mode of being.

I offer the following as a correct definition of *aion* as used in the New Testament:

Aion. 1. An age, an indefinite period; a long or seemingly long time; hence the idea of lastingness, and perhaps endlessness. 2. The duration of the Jewish state; the duration of the reign of Christ. 3. Spirit; a spiritual being, an angel. 4. A mode or manner of existence; this life; the after-death life.

The adjective αιωνιος = *aionios*, from the noun *aion*, is, in the Common Version, most usually rendered either "eternal" or "everlasting." Its true signification corresponds to either the first, second, or third sense of its root; as given above; or sometimes, perhaps to its fourth sense; — that is, it has reference either to duration in general; or to the duration, or to the termination, of the Jewish, or the Christian dispensation — so called —; or to spirituality in a religious sense; or perhaps sometimes in a celestial sense.

In the passage which speaks of "the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ," which kingdom — we are elsewhere informed — he will in "the end" deliver up to God from whom he received it, it *may* be doubtful whether *aionios* is to be understood in the sense of "age-lasting," or of "spiritual," seeing that Christ's kingdom possesses both these characteristics in an eminent degree. [1]

In that text where the apostle is made to speak of "eternal judgment," *aionios*, rendered "eternal,"

[1] 2 Pet. i 11; 1 Cor. xv. 24.

clearly signifies "pertaining to the age" — an idea we have no single word to express; since neither *agic* or *agical,* not yet *aginal*, each of which is legitimately formed, has as yet the fortune to be admitted into our *familia verborum.*

In the parable of the sheep and the goats, — so called, — *aionios*, rendered "everlasting" and "eternal," is usually supposed to mean *endless.* It is a fact, however, that the judgment there set forth is of a *national* character; and as a national award can hardly be more than age-lasting, that is, lasting for one or more ages. That it is indeed national, is evinced by the circumstance that the *separation* there described is of "nations."[1] (See Chap. xix of this work.)

In a certain place Paul affirms thus: "The things which are seen are temporal, but the things which are not seen are eternal."[2] The word here rendered "temporal" signifies properly *temporary*, that is, for a time only, or for a short time; and *aionios*, rendered "eternal," being put in *contrast* with the other word, plainly imports *lasting* or abiding, that is, for an indefinite time. The invisible things in mention are indeed spiritual, — there can be no doubt as to this, — but the particular property here meant to be affirmed of them, is their *lasting-ness.* (Note. It is not *all* invisible things of which the apostle is here speaking. See the context.)

In a few texts, aionios life may relate to the constitution of our natures, as beings destined to a continuous, lasting, celestial life, beyond this transient state. Thus an apostle says, "This is the record that God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in His Son." "These things have

[1] Matt. xxv. 32. [2] 2 Cor. iv. 18.

I written to you who believe on the name of the Son of God, that ye may know that ye have eternal life."[1] Yet, as I view the case,

In most of those texts of Scripture wherein aionios is joined with *life*, the expression —, instead of being translated "eternal life," or "everlasting life," — ought to be rendered "spiritual life," and the word spiritual be understood in a *religious* sense. Such life is the companion of Christian faith; and each is an assistant to the other.

Spiritual or religious *life*, as possessed in this mode of being, and Scripturally denominated "aionios life," or simply "life," is *an active state* of the spiritual faculties and feelings, attended with a very great degree of enjoyment. This spiritual activity coëxists with a strong faith, a lively hope, and an expansive charity, indicating and promoting a preponderance of the religious emotions and moral sentiments over the sensuous feelings and animal propensities, and inducing pure thoughts, kind words, and just and benevolent actions. As was set forth in our last chapter, it would seem from the Scriptures, that in such persons not only has the germ of the spiritual organism actually germinated, but also — in such — that "the inward man," while enveloped in "the outward," really becomes in a measure *unfolded;* for that, in such persons, at times, if not habitually, one or more of the faculties proper to spirit life are truly in exercise, though, of course, in an imperfect manner. "*Now* we *see*," says Paul, comparing the present life with the future; but he immediately adds, "through a glass, darkly," "*Now* I *know*," is his affirmation; but he quickly subjoins, "in part:"

[1] 1 John v. 11, 13.

"Now we see through a glass, darkly; but then, face to face; now I know in part; but then shall I know even as also I am known." 1 Cor. xiii. 12.

The opposite of spiritual life, or rather the *absence* of such life, is, in the Scriptures, denominated simply "death," without any qualifying term whatever. This death consists in *a dormant state* of the spiritual or religious faculties and feelings, attended, if not with absolute misery, with at least a very great lack of enjoyment. This spiritual dormancy seems clearly to indicate that in the subjects of it the germ of the spiritual organism is little if any unfolded, and hence that the perceptive faculties of "the inward man" are in a quite undeveloped state. To such specimens of humanity applies the following declaration:

"The natural* [*or* animal] man receiveth not the things of the spirit of God; for they are foolishness to him; neither can he know them because they are *Spiritually discerned.*" 1 Cor. ii. 14. (Read the next verse.)

Persons in the condition above described are represented not only as *blind*, but also as "dead," and sometimes also as "dead in sin"; but it should be observed that the deadness and the sinfulness are merely accompanying states, and not by any means identical. The former is indeed productive of the latter, in so far at least as overt acts are concerned; and the latter is clearly promotive of the former, even to the bringing of men into a state of death *repeatedly;*† yet each state is distinct from the other.

Those persons to whom the glorified Saviour *sent* a converted Saul "to open their eyes, to turn

* For some remarks on the word here rendered "natural," see Chap. iv of this work — phrase, "a natural body."

† See Ezek. xviii. 21--28; xxxiii. 13--16. Also Chap. xx of this work.

them from darkness to light," &c., were evidently of the description mentioned in the text above cited from 1 Cor. ii. It was those who *had* been such, to whom this same apostle afterward wrote, "And you hath he quickened who *were* dead in trespasses and sins."[1]

There are several Greek words rendered "judgment," "judge," &c., but they are all of similar import. In the phrase, "day of judgment," the word for "judgment" is *krisis*, signifying, 1, the same as does the English word "crisis;" 2, a judicial trial; 3, a judicial verdict, whether for or against the party judged; &c. See Chap. xvii. In the phrase "eternal judgment," the word rendered "judgment" is *krima*, having evidently the same sense that *krisis* would there have.

The word rendered "perdition," and sometimes "destruction," in the Common Version, is *apoleia*, from the verb *apollumi*, to destroy, to lose, to perish, &c. The word perdition may have been a proper rendering of *apoleia*, once; but it is far from being so, now.

Apoleia signifies loss, destruction, or ruin; more commonly, the loss of life, or of something implying the loss of life; as the loss, to a general, of his troops, slain; the loss to any one, of a relative, deceased; &c. Sometimes, however, the loss does not even imply death; as the loss of soldiers, made prisoners; the loss of friends, who cease to be such.

The true sense of *apoleia*, in most texts, is equivalent either to "loss," or to destruction." Where Jesus is made to say concerning His apostles, "none of them is *lost* but the son of per-

[1] Acts xxvi. 17, 18; Eph. ii. 1.

dition," the text were much better rendered, "none of them is lost but the son of *loss*." But where Paul tells of "the son of perdition" whom the Lord was ere long to "*destroy* with the brightness of His coming," the appropriate rendering is clearly "the son of perdition." [1] In at least one text where *apoleia* is rendered "perdition," the word "*ruin*" might be a good rendering; since, in that place, temporal ruin is evidently the catastrophe intended:

"They that will be rich fall into temptation and a snare, and into many foolish and hurtful lusts, [properly, "desires,"] which drown men in destruction and perdition. [Or "ruin."] For the love of money is the root of all evil: which while some coveted after, they have erred from the faith, and pierced themselves through with many sorrows." 1 Tim. vi. 9, 10.

[1] John xvii. 12; 2 Thess. ii. 3–8.

## CHAPTER VII.

### SCRIPTURAL DEFINITIONS — CONCLUDED.

THE word *diabolos*, usually rendered "devil," signifies, in general, an adversary or enemy with evil motives, and, in the Scriptures, is applied to a deceiver, a traitor, a persecutor, &c., but never to a spiritual being, excepting, possibly, in one instance, by a figure of speech, where *diseases* seem to be ascribed to "the devil." Those desiring to see this subject discussed at length, might do well to read Balfour's "Inquiry into the Scriptural Doctrine concerning the Devil and Satan."

The word rendered "satan" is *satanas*, which imports an adversary whose motives may be either bad or good; while *diabolos*, as has been said, imports an adversary with evil motives. Thus Jesus, when Peter opposed Him, addressed him as merely a "satan," the motives of Peter being humanly good; but when He spoke of *Judas* as an opposer, he styled him "a devil," since, by whatever ethical rule estimated, the motives of Judas were clearly bad.[1]

In a few texts, satan seems to import a mere physical evil, considered as an adversary to human happiness; as in the case of the woman "bowed together" with *infirmity*, concerning whom, after

[1] Mark viii. 33; John vi. 70, 71.

He had healed her, the Saviour said that she had been bound thus by "satan." (It should be rendered "a satan," if it is proper to use this word at all in English.) A like view is usually taken of the "messenger of satan" — literally "angel-satan" — complained of by the apostle.[1] In one other text also, as has been said, it would seem that diseases are ascribed to the *devil.* Thus Peter says of Jesus, that He "went about doing good, and *healing* all that were oppressed of the devil."[2]

As the name of God implies *good,* so the term devil implies *evil,* considered in its character of opposition to good. Hence devil, in the Scriptures, sometimes imports the abstract principle of opposition to good; as when Paul, addressing an opposer who "withstood" him and Barnabas, characterized him as a "child of the devil;" or when an other apostle affirms that "*whosoever committeth sin is of the devil!*" and that "*in this*" the children of the devil are manifest!!![3] Sometimes also the term devil seems to stand for *the persecuting power,* whether that power were considered as concentrated in an individual ruler, or whether allusion were had to the whole body of persecutors taken together; as when Peter, addressing some of the early Christians in reference to the "afflictions" which they, in common with other Christians, were constantly liable to from the persecuting opposers of Christianity, exhorts, "Be sober, be vigilant; because your adversary the devil, as a roaring lion, walketh about seeking whom he may devour: whom resist, steadfast in the faith."[4]

[1] Luke xiii. 11-16; 2 Cor. xii. 7. (See remarks of commentators on this last text.)
[2] Acts x. 38.
[3] Acts xiii. 8-10; John iii. 8-10.
[4] 1 Peter v. 8, 9.

So in the Revelation, a certain power, under the figure of a dragon or serpent, and which is expressly said to be "called the devil, and satan," is as expressly said to have "persecuted" a certain symbolical personage, and sought "to *devour* her child;" also, as proceeding "to make war with" those having "the testimony of Jesus Christ," that is, with the Christians. And we learn that these did as Peter exhorted to do; for it is added that "they overcame him [the dragon] by the blood of the Lamb, and by the word of their testimony," &c.[1]

Though the term Satan, in most English versions, has always — as in this work it now, *for once*, has — a Capital letter for its Initial, and thus appears as a proper noun or *name*, like Simon or Judas, there is eminent authority for saying that "satan," or the word so rendered, was *not* a proper name in the language of the Jews, but was a mere appellative, or common name, like adversary, traitor, &c.

The word rendered "devil" and "devils" when persons are said to *have* them, or to be *possessed* with them, is *daimon*, (or a kindred term,) which in Latin becomes *dæmon*, and from this comes the English word *demon*. "Demon" is clearly the proper rendering of *daimon*, &c., instead of "devil." Demons were thought to be the spirits of departed human beings, who were believed to have the power of entering into the bodies of the living, causing strange and incurable diseases, and various morbid affections both of body and mind. Thus Josephus describes "demons" as being "the spirits of the wicked, that enter into men that are

[1] Revelation xii. 4, 9, 11, 13, 17.

alive, and kill them unless they can obtain some help against them." *

From certain cases in the gospels where the attendant *symptoms* are incidentally given, it would seem that the diseases believed to be produced by demoniacal agency, were, for the most part, some form of insanity, or of "fits." Thus the man who — as probably he and others supposed — was possessed with a whole legion or regiment of spirits, and who is represented as preternaturally strong, and entirely uncontrollable, was doubtless furiously insane. One who had a *dumb* devil was probably a hypochondriac or melancholy person; an other, having a "dumb and deaf spirit," was perhaps a natural deaf mute; and both he and the boy who is described as "lunatic," both of whom also, when attacked, *fell*, whether "on the ground," "into the fire," or "into the water," (and who indeed may have been one and the same individual,) were manifestly afflicted with epilepsy or falling-sickness.[1] And so of the rest.

It is certain that *diabolical* possessions, in the commonly-understood sense of that expression, are not taught in even one text of Scripture rightly translated and interpreted; yet that *demoniacal* possessions are wholly unscriptural, the writer hereof does not feel called on to affirm, nor, indeed, to deny. It does not seem likely, however, that *diseases* were produced in those days by the agency of possessing spirits; nor can it be shown with certainty that the New Testament writers, as also our Saviour, in employing the current phrase-

* See Jewish War, Book VII. chap. vi. section 3; and the authors quoted and referred to by Whittemore on the Revelation, at xvi. 13.

[1] Mark v. 2, 9; Luke xi. 11, 14; Mark ix. 25, 20, 22; Matt. xvii. 15.

ology, intended to vouch for the verity of such possessions. But there can be no doubt that possessions by demons or human ghosts, and this operating as the cause of various diseases, was, in the time of Christ, and later, a very generally received and highly popular doctrine.

"In one place, "a certain damsel" is spoken of as being "possessed of a spirit of divination," and as having "brought her masters much gain by soothsaying"—in more modern parlance, "by fortune-telling." But the historian goes on to relate that Paul . . . . said to the spirit, "I command thee in the name of Jesus Christ to come out of her;" and that "he [the spirit] came out that same hour;" also, that, ere long, "her masters saw that the hope of their gains was gone,"—from which it is manifest that she ceased soothsaying from that time.[1] Query. What really happened to this young woman upon Paul's commanding the divining spirit to leave her?

The reason why the demons or possessing spirits believed in by the Jews, were by them deemed and denominated "*unclean* spirits," was probably because they were supposed to hover around *graves*, and other depositories of the dead, contact with which rendered any person "unclean" for a time. See the law of Moses on this subject, as referred to below.[2] In accordance with this idea, is the fact that the individual who was reputed to have a "legion" of unclean spirits within him, is described as having his dwelling among the tombs."[3]

The word rendered "angel" is *aggelos*, (com-

[1] Acts xvi. 16–19. See Mark xvi. 17.
[2] Numbers xix. 11–16.
[3] Mark v. 2–9. Compare Luke viii. 26–30.

monly written *angelos*,) which originally signified merely a *messenger*, — but which seems to have come to be used also in the sense of representative or delegate. It is thus the name of an office, irrespective of the nature or standing of the one holding it; and in accordance with this circumstance is the fact that the word is applied, in the Scriptures, not merely to celestial spirits, but also to men in the flesh. Thus John, the Baptist, is declared by the Saviour to have been a "messenger" — *angelos* — of the Lord or Jehovah, sent by HIM to prepare the Messiah's way before Him. The "messengers" also which the Baptist, while in prison, "sent" to Christ, are called, in the original, the *angels* of John.[1] And in the Revelation, which book was written to be sent to the seven churches in Asia, each of the seven messages contained therein is addressed to some individual in the church named, such individual being styled "the angel" or representative of that particular church: "To the angel of the church in Ephesus, write;" and so of the rest.[2] Note. It is a curious fact that those messages purport to have been dictated to John by the glorified Saviour, seemingly in person; and yet that they are described as being "what the *Spirit* said to the churches."

Not only is the New Testament term for angel used sometimes in the sense of representative, but this usage of the word *angelos* seems to be a transcript of the usage of the corresponding word in the Old Testament. Thus, in several passages, the following or a similar train of circumstances is to be observed: An angel appears, and *personates* the supreme God, speaking in HIS name without the preface used by the prophets, "Thus saith the

[1] Luke vii. 19, 24, 27. [2] Rev. i. 11, 20; ii. 1, 11, &c.

LORD;" and in the progress of the account the writer attributes the announcement directly to God, — or (, as in at least one case,) makes the seer of the angel speak of having seen God. It is hence apparent that, in the early times, angels were regarded as *representatives* of Jehovah; and that, in at least many instances, where we read that in those days God spoke to men thus and so, — though, to us, the language may seem to affirm that HE spoke thus personally, — the Scripture writers intended and expected to be understood as teaching that HE spoke thus through an angel:

"And the Angel of the LORD appeared to him in a flame of fire out of the midst of a bush; and he looked, and, behold, the bush burned with fire, but the bush was not consumed. And Moses said, 'I will now turn aside, and see this great sight, why the bush is not burned.' And when the LORD saw that he turned aside to see, God called to him out of the midst of the bush, and said, 'Moses, Moses!' And he said, 'Here am I.' And He said, 'Draw not nigh hither,' &c. Moreover he said, 'I am the God of thy father, the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob.' And Moses hid his face, for he was afraid to look upon God." Gen. iii. 2–6.

So in regard to the parents of Samson, we are told by the sacred historian, that an "*angel* of the LORD" was seen by them: and that "Manoah knew not that he was an *angel*," but considered him only as a "*man* of God;" also, that when the angel ascended into the flame of the sacrifice offered by Manoah, "then Manoah knew that he was an angel of the LORD. And Manoah said to his wife "*We shall surely die because we have seen God.*" [1]

In later times, (and perhaps also earlier, in some instances,) the prophets received divine communications *without* seeing a celestial representative of God. Read the case of Samuel, in 1 Sam. third

[1] Judges xiii. 3–23.

chapter. It therefore is there said, "And the word of the LORD was precious in those days; there was no open vision."

Heaven is literally *the region or world above.* The term has a variety of applications, indicating the several regions where the birds fly, the clouds float, and the stars are located, — also the imaginary residence of the heathen deities. In the Christian sense, as applied to super-mundane things, it is where God's presence is specially manifested; where Jesus Christ has gone; and where also dwell those who, as the apostle tells us, "are heavenly," or are as in Christ. Figuratively, it is used instead of the name of God; it denotes also the state of Christian believers on earth; any exalted condition, &c.

That the word heaven, in the Christian sense, is truly the name of a spiritual *place* as well as of a spiritual state, will hardly be disputed. The correctness of the position is evident from a great number of considerations, of which the following are a sample:

Verbs of motion, adverbs of place, and prepositions expressive of local relations, are used in speaking of Christ and heaven, just as in speaking of Him and some place on the earth. Thus in like manner as we read that "he entered into Capernaum," and, afterward, that he "went . . . . into a city called Ephraim, and there continued with his disciples;" —— so are we certified that He has "gone into heaven;" that he has "entered . . . . into heaven itself," *not* "into the holy places made with hands, which are the figures of the true" ones; — and we are informed that a little before his departure he "plainly" said to his disciples, "I go to prepare a place for you. And . . . . I will

come again, and receive you to myself, that where I am, there ye may be also." [1]

In regard to the *location* of heaven, the Scriptures plainly enough indicate its *direction* from us, but do not give its distance. Heaven, in the Scriptures, is every where taken to be overhead, or above us, and this at all times, and in different countries.

To our external perceptions, the earth's surface, as a whole, is *flat* — is a plain, diversified with hills and valleys, and remaining at rest in the midst of the moving universe. So the spiritual heaven, as mortals have caught a view of it by spiritual sight, appears as a world spread out in like manner above us. Witness the case of Stephen, who, being fully spiritualized, — so to speak, — was favored with a clear and distinct view of the spiritual heavens while looking intently and perseveringly upward into the sensible heaven or sky:

> "He, being full of the Holy Spirit, looked up steadfastly into heaven, and saw the glory of God, . . . and said, "Behold I see the heavens opened, and the Son of man standing on the right hand of God." Acts vii. 55, 56.

But the earth is known to be a *sphere*, either solid or hollow, inhabited on opposite sides. And, by parity of reasoning, heaven, being above the earth, is also a sphere, encompassing at least earth's habitable zones. Certain rather alarming *objections* relating to the doctrine of the locality of heaven, are, by this view of the subject, rendered entirely harmless. For an example, take the objection *couchant* in the following question: If heaven is in an upward direction from us at this moment, which way will it be from us twelve hours hence?

The Greek word rendered "heaven" — *ouranos*

1 Peter iii. 22; Hebrew ix. 24; John xiv. 2, 3.

— is often *pluralized* in the Scriptures, sometimes, no doubt, by way of eminence; as for example, when employed instead of the name of God. "The kingdom [*or* reign] of heaven," wherever that phrase occurs, is rightly "the kingdom [*or* reign] of the heavens;" — the commencement of the Lord's prayer might be properly rendered, "Our Father, the One in the heavens;" — and "your Father who is in heaven," is more literally, "your Father, the One in the heavens."

Is it a Scripture doctrine that there actually exists a *plurality* of spiritual heavens? From the statement of Paul that he had known a man who, either in the body or out," was caught up to the *third* heaven;" as likewise from his affirmation that Jesus Christ "ascended far above all [the] heavens," the inference seems not an unreasonable one, that at least this apostle believed in more heavens than one.[1] Observe, also, that Jesus said, "In my Father's house are many mansions;" — moreover, that it was "the heavens," in the plural number, which were "opened" to Stephen's spiritual vision; — and further, that Solomon, in more than one instance, makes mention of "the heaven of heavens."[2]

In those texts where mention is made of Christ's *coming*, the noun "coming," as it occurs in the Common Version, is from the Greek *parousia*, derived from the verb *pareimi*, which may signify "*to come*" to a place, allusion being had to the journey thither; or "*to arrive*" at a place, alluding merely to the termination of the journey; or "*to be present*" in a place, with no other allusion to journeying than is contained in the implication

[1] 2 Cor. xii. 2, 4; Eph. iv. 10.
[2] John xiv. 2; Acts v. 56; 1 Kings viii. 27: 2 Chron ii. 6; vi. 18. (Compare Ezek. i. 1; Matt. iii. 16.)

of a previous absence. According to circumstances, then, the noun *parousia* may import simply "presence," or it may mean "arrival," or it may signify "coming." In 1 Cor. xv. 23, and in 1 Thes. iv. 15, I translate this word "arrival."

To me, the Scriptures teach two distinct comings of Christ over and above his introduction into this mortal state. See chap. xvi. of this work. When applied to the latter of these, I translate *parousia* "arrival." See last chapter of this work.

## CHAPTER VIII.

### MORTALIZATION IN ADAM.

THE doctrine prevails, rather generally, that Adam, the first of the human race, was created immortal, and that he lost his immortality by sinning; also, that not merely himself, but all his posterity, to the latest generation, became mortalized —, so to speak, — by his sin. I object to this dogma as being grossly unreasonable as well as wholly unsupported by the Scriptures.

Suppose that previous to his transgression, while yet he was as truly immortal as he had ever been, our venerable common Progenitor had by some means happened to fall into the "river" of Eden, in flood-time. Such an event is surely supposable. Let it be supposed also, that he sank beneath the surface, and remained submerged for a day or two, and that then, by the subsidence of the freshet, he was left upon dry land. Is it to be believed that — no miracle occurring — he would, at the end of that time, have found himself undrowned?

If the summit of a perpendicular *cliff* several hundred feet in height had been attained by him, and while standing on its brink his footing had given way, and no angelic hand had borne him up, and so he had been precipitated upon the granite

pavement at its base, would not the fall and collision have killed him?

Suppose, however, that, from some cause, the descension and collision above described, had altogether failed of injuring him; yet that a ponderous *rock*, the first movement of which had occasioned his fall, should have tumbled down immediately after him, and struck directly upon his person; — no spiritual intervention being present; — could it have happened otherwise than that he would have been crushed to death?

The foregoing, and many similar questions, admit, respectively, of but one rational answer; and by it is shown the absurdity of the supposition that the bodily structure of Adam was ever properly immortal, any more than are those of his descendants.

It is true that *death* was the penalty affixed to the first prohibitory law given by the Creator to man; and it is also true that Adam and Eve violated that law, and of course incurred the penalty. Yet it is further true, that, by the positive enactment of the Lawgiver, the penalty, whatever might have been its precise nature, was to be certainly inflicted in the very day of transgression. After forbidding "the man" to eat the fruit of a certain tree, — so runs the allegory, — the Lord God said expressly, "In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." [1] It is hence entirely obvious, that

> If He who can not lie declared the truth,
> Our first Sire died the day that he transgressed.
> But no one questions God's veracity,
> Nor doubts that as to bodily demise,
> Adam did *not* die *that* day, but survived
> Day after day, on, on, through many years.

[1] Gen. ii. 17.

It follows hence that when Jehovah said
Adam should die the day he ate the fruit,
Corporeal dying could not have been meant,
But dying in some secondary sense, —
Perhaps the sense intended in the text,
"The wages [ — daily pay * — ] of sin is death."

We read, indeed, that "by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men for that all have sinned." But this text obviously yields no support to the notion that Adam and all his posterity, to the latest generation, became mortal by his first transgression. The context shows conclusively, that death is here used in a *metaphorical* or secondary sense, it being actually contrasted with "justification of life." Besides, the text does by no means affirm that death, in any sense, is the doom of all merely because *one* man sinned; but it expressly says, "and so death passed upon all men for that *all* have sinned." It occurs in the same connection with the text which assures us that "the wages of sin is death"; and it perfectly coincides with the one which says, "The soul that sinneth it shall die." [1]

The passages wherein it is said that "since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead," will be commented upon at some length near the close of this work. (See Chap. xxxv.) In this place, I remark merely that the first man who was known to have died, revealed death as the destiny of the living, in like manner as the

* Dr. A. Clarke, in his Commentary, lets us know that the word rendered "wages" in Rom. vi. 23, originally "signified the daily pay of a Roman soldier." In the *marginal* rendering of Luke iii. 14, Common Version, the word is translated "allowance," (importing what we now call "rations,") which, if not always dealt out daily, was issued from time to time, and at *not long* intervals.

[1] Rom. v. 12, 18; vi. 23; Ezek. xviii. 4, 20.

first who was known to have arisen to an other life, revealed the resurrection as the destiny of the dead. To adopt the phraseology of the text in hand, *death* "came" — or, more properly, "was shown" — by the one; and *the resurrection* "came" — or "has been shown" — by the other.[1]

We are informed by the sacred historian that "God created man in his own image"; and we have been informed by sage divines that Adam *lost* that image, and that hence all his posterity come into the world without it. Granting the truth of this latter information, it might be very plausibly argued that what Adam lost was his spiritual nature, rendering him altogether *animalic*, hence in all respects mortal; and therefore that *we* are in that condition. The facts of the case, however, are, that, in the first place, the Scriptures no where teach that Adam by his transgression lost the Divine image; and, secondly, it is stated in the New Testament, as a constant and universal fact, that "men . . . . . are made after the similitude of God."[2]

[1] 1 Cor. xv. 21. [2] Gen. i. 27; v. i; James iii. 9.

## CHAPTER IX.

### ANNIHILATION.

It is held by persons connected with various Christian sects, that the final destiny of a considerable number of the human race is to be utter annihilation. The doctrine is held in a variety of forms, seemingly according to the constitutional or the educational bias of the person holding it. Thus,

Most annihilationists —, if I mistake not, — reject the doctrine of endless torments with horror; but at least a few profess to think that to be struck out of existence would be a greater evil than to suffer endlessly. Some evidently suppose an exercise of special power requisite to reduce the sinner to a state of nothingness; while perhaps the greater number totally reject the popular dogma of the immortality of the soul, and so contend that the sinful have but to be let alone in order to drop at once into absolute non-existence.

Some seem to anticipate for the wicked merely a sudden extinction of being; while others appear to expect for them a lingering death in intense torments. Some have held that the existence of the wicked will continue until they are sentenced to death, judicially; others that such persons cease to exist, on the death of the body. According to

some, the wicked will be raised, and then adjudged to utter death; while others contend that, for this class, there is no resurrection at all.

And so forth, &c.

I propose to present two principal arguments bearing directly against this doctrine, in all and each of its various forms and modifications; also, to offer some remarks upon certain texts and classes of texts which are, or may be, adduced in its support.

1. A firm belief in the reality of the catastrophe contemplated by the doctrine of the utter annihilation of the wicked, is *not* calculated to give comfort to a bereaved mourner, who is exercised by parental affection, and views the victim of said catastrophe to be a beloved child.

The point of this is, that "the gospel" is directly calculated to administer comfort to "*all* who mourn," and, of course to all bereaved parents. This we may soon see, by comparing and considering a passage from "the evangelical prophet," and an account given in the New Testament:

Isa. lxi. 1--3. "The Spirit of the Lord God is upon me; because the Lord hath anointed me to preach good tidings to the meek; he hath sent me to bind up the broken-hearted, . . . . . to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord, and the day of vengeance of our God; *to comfort all who mourn;* to appoint to those who mourn in Zion, to give them beauty for ashes, the oil of joy for mourning, the garment of praise for the spirit of heaviness," &c.

Luke iv. 17--21. "And there was delivered to him the book of the prophet Esaias. And when he had opened the book, he found the place where it was written, 'The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because He hath anointed me to preach the gospel to the poor, he hath sent me to heal the broken-hearted, . . . . . to preach the acceptable year of the Lord.' And he closed the book, . . . . . and sat down . . . . . And he began to say to them, "This day is this Scripture fulfilled."

Observe, here, that for "good tidings" in the prophet, we have "gospel" in the evangelist; that Jesus applied the passage to himself, as being THE Gospel Preacher; and that though Luke does not proceed with his quotation far enough to speak of "the day of vengeance" or retribution, — which doubtless Jesus read, — he also, by the same means, does not transcribe that significant expression, — which also doubtless Jesus read, as being a part of his commission, — "*to comfort all who mourn.*"

The term *Christianity* primarily imports the religion of a person called "Christ." But Jesus Christ did not himself give that appellation to the system of truths by him presented. *He* called it by a name which we translate "gospel," and which all agree signifies good news. This is a name of great significance, and is evidently indicative of the *quality* of Christian truths, since it was by means of those truths, announced either personally or by proxy, that the great Preacher was to officiate as a universal Comforter. I argue, then, that

Any system of doctrine which presents, as a final result, that which will *not* comfort at least all "those who mourn in Zion," — alias *Christian* mourners, — must needs differ essentially from the pure gospel of Christ.

And I also freely confess that

If the doctrine of the annihilation of the wicked has any gospel in it for the affectionate father or mother mourning the death of a wayward, impenitent, skeptical child, I have altogether misread the parental heart.

To say that annihilation is better than endless suffering, is saying nothing to the purpose, any more than to say, as some have said, that endless

suffering is better than annihilation. The one may be *less bad* than the other; yet, strictly speaking, neither of them is better. To a good man, there is really no good news in the one nor in the other; and the fact that this may be preferred to that, or that to this, *in a choice of evils*, is by no means to be taken as proof that either belongs to the simple good-news system presented by Jesus, the Christ.

Note. Whatever of applicancy and force there may be in the foregoing argument as an objection to the doctrine of annihilation, it is obvious that were it directed against the doctrine of endless punishment, so very generally received among Christians, it would apply every way as well, and certainly with no less cogency.

2. The Apostle Paul teaches expressly that death itself —, that is to say, *human* death,— shall, at the last, "be destroyed." This, to my mind, *negatives* the doctrine in hand; since, according to this doctrine, human death is to have an endless reign, — so to speak, — and millions of victims, are to be endlessly subject to its power.

The passage containing the text alluded to, reads thus:

"Then cometh the end, when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father; when he shall have put down all rule, and all authority, and power. For he must reign, till he hath put all enemies under his feet. The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death. For he hath put all things under his feet. But when he saith, all things are put under him, it is manifest that He is excepted who did put all things under him. And when all things shall be subdued to him, then shall the Son also himself be subject to Him who put all things under him, that God may be all in all." 1 Cor. xv. 24–28.

Observe, here, that the apostle is treating of the *reign* of Christ in his kingdom; and that, according to the apostle, this reign of Christ is to con-

tinue until all enemies and all things are put under His feet.

"The expression, "put under his feet," is manifestly not to be taken in a literal sense; and it is an exceedingly valuable fact that, both when applied to "all enemies," and, to "all things," the phrase in mention is followed by its appropriate *synonym.* Thus "put all *enemies* under his feet," is followed by "the last enemy that shall be *destroyed;*" and "put all *things* under his feet," is followed by "and when all things shall be *subdued*" or subjected.

We perceive, then, that to put the enemies under his feet is to *destroy* them. And it must be confessed that the meaning which *annihilationists* are wont to affix to the term destroy, is undeniably its meaning in this text. For though to destroy, may mean, in many instances, to punish by depriving the culprit of mere bodily life; and though "death" is here *personified,* and thus spoken of as though a living being; the figure manifestly recognizes this common-sense idea, that when the thing personified is deprived of its life, it is also deprived of *existence* in every proper sense of the word. We have it, then, that Christ is to annihilate all enemies, and that death is destined to be the last.

But who or what are the rest of the enemies? Are they those individuals of mankind who are inimical to Christ, their lawful Sovereign? It would seem not; for "the *last* enemy" is not of the human race, nor indeed of any race, but is simply the condition, or the process, denominated "death;" and, by parity of reasoning, the *other* enemies are not human beings, but are those conditions, practices, principles, &c., which are inimical to the prosperity of Christ's kingdom. One of these enemies (, over and above death, and which,

of course, is to be destroyed *before* death will be destroyed,) is clearly "the carnal mind," which this same apostle elsewhere tells us, is "*enmity* against God:" adding, "for it is *not subject* to the law of God, neither indeed *can* be."[1]

The apostle assures us here, however, that "all things" are to be "subdued" or subjected to Christ, and, of course, to God; and that "then shall the Son also himself be subject." The word "also," as here used, clearly evinces, to me, that to be "subdued," is, properly, to be subjected; that the expression, "all things," imports neither more nor less than all human beings; that all human beings will at length become "subject," even as "also" Christ will "then" be; and that no human being is destined to be "destroyed," in the annihilational sense of the term, any more than is even the Saviour himself.

Suppose, however, that inimical human beings *are* to be annihilated, *not* subjected. Jesus then commences and carries on among them the work of annihilation, adding death to death, until all human enemies are put out of existence. The "enmity" that was in them, alias "the carnal mind," and indeed every thing in any manner or degree *sinful*, is, of course, put out of existence with them. But the destruction of the last inimical human being, and with him the last vestige of human enmity, depravity, and *sin*, would by no means be — scripturally — the destruction of "the last *enemy*." "The *last* enemy . . . . is death."

When all enemies shall be destroyed excepting death, where will death be, and upon whom can it exert its inimical power? Obviously in and upon that class of human beings, and that class alone,

[1] Rom. viii. 7.

the last of whom the Saviour will have just put to death. The immortalized saints will be no more under the power of death than is our Lord himself. It is declared concerning Christ, that "death hath no more dominion over him." And it is just as certainly declared, "We know that . . . . . we shall be like Him." [1]

The question is now submitted to the intelligent and candid reader, whether, when one portion of mankind are immortalized, and the other annihilated, these latter will not have to be restored to life, in order for death to be destroyed. At this crisis, must not the language of that Scripture be necessarily and literally fulfilled, wherein an apostle declares, in just so many words, "As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive?" [2]

If the reader will consult certain passages to be presently referred to, he will learn that Christ is to *destroy* "the devil," as also his "works." [3] According to these Scriptures, *destructiveness*, as manifested by our Lord, is under the guidance of *benevolence* — an unmistakable indication that He will never annihilate any of "the offspring of God."

There are certain passages of Scripture in which destruction is undeniably set forth as the doom of some; but on an examination of those Scriptures, it will be found that far the greater number of them relate to the destinies of mankind in an *associated* capacity, of which the following text is an example: "And when he had destroyed seven nations in the land of Canaan, he divided their land to them by lot." [4] So in the Psalms:

[1] Romans vi. 9: 1 John iii. 2. [2] 1 Cor. xv. 22.
[3] Hebrew ii. 14; 1 John iii. 8. [4] Acts xiii. 19.

"Thou hast rebuked the heathen, thou hast destroyed the wicked, thou hast put out their name for ever and ever." Here, "the heathen" are obviously the heathen *nations;* and besides, the next verse says, "Thou hast destroyed *cities;* their memorial is perished with them." [1] A nation may be destroyed, and no more exist as such; a city may be demolished, and, of course, utterly depopulated; the very *name* of a nation or city may be lost from human language; yea, even the fact that either of them ever existed, may come to be entirely unknown to any person on earth; — and yet the *people* of such nation or city may be far from being annihilated.

Moses assures the Israelites, that in case they should transgress to a certain extent they would certainly be "destroyed." It is afterward recorded of one branch of the nation, that "the Lord was gracious to them, . . . . . and would not destroy them, neither cast He them from his presence *as yet;*" that is, as we soon find it explained, they were not yet "carried away out of their own land." In reference to the other branch of the nation, the Lord is represented as afterward saying, "I will remove *Judah also* out of my sight, as I have removed Israel;" and it is subsequently declared that He actually did "cast them out from His presence," — which transaction, however, is explained thus: "So Judah was carried away out of their land." [2]

The Apostle Paul, in speaking of those who "troubled" the early Christians by *persecuting* them, declared that they should "be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the

[1] Psalms ix. 5, 6.
[2] Deut. xxviii. 48, 51; 2 Kings xiii. 23; xvii. 23; xxiii. 27; xxiv 20; xxv. 21.

Lord."[1] This language — or most of it — is manifestly borrowed from the Old Testament; and, creeds out of sight, would it not seem likely to have here the same style of meaning it has when used there? The sense, then, is, that that persecuting nation, the Jews, were to be destroyed in a governmental capacity, and totally ejected from the land of Judea. (See Jer. xxiii. 39, 40.)

In not a great number of instances, destruction is set forth as the destiny of individuals. It then denotes either the loss of bodily life, as it does in most of the cases, — or some kind of temporal ruin, as it may in a few instances, — or else it is synonymous with *death* in a figurative sense.

Paul, in one place, speaks of certain persons "whose end is destruction."[2] This destruction was of course personal with each individual; but it was certainly of a temporal nature; and from the language of the context, there can be little doubt that it was a part of the national punishment about to be inflicted upon the Jews. The apostle begins the chapter with cautioning the brethren against Judaizing teachers; — so to call them; — and he finally characterizes them as "the enemies of the cross of Christ." That is, though claiming to hold the Christian doctrine, they wished to be thought Jews, being quite unwilling to acknowledge themselves followers of a man who had been publicly executed as a malefactor, — and this, too, by the most disgraceful of all deaths, that of the cross. They therefore were not at all likely to heed the Saviour's admonition in Luke xxi. 20, 21, and elsewhere; and so were altogether likely to share the common fate of the Jews. Besides, too, the apostle represents them as being extremely gluttonous, if not drunken persons,

[1] 1 Thess. ii. 15; 2 Thess. i. 9. [2] Phill. iii. 18, 19.

applying this significant language to them, "Whose god is their stomach." * Such could hardly escape the impending national destruction. "Take heed to yourselves," said the Saviour to his disciples, "lest at any time your hearts be overcharged with surfeiting," &c., "and so that day come upon you unawares." [1]

Of similar import to the foregoing from Paul, is the declaration of Peter in reference to certain sensual and greatly licentious persons, that they "shall utterly perish in their own corruption." I see no reason for supposing that more is here meant than the disease and premature death occasioned by gluttony, drunkenness, &c. See the context, — as also a passage in Jude referred to below. [2]

Those texts in the Revelation where mention is made of "the second death," seem to teach the infliction of *pain*, rather than a cessation of life. Besides, as we have already seen, Christ is to *destroy* death. The Revelator also speaks of a time when, as he declares, "There shall be no more death." [3] At that time, even the second death can have no existence.

Annihilationists are wont to lay great stress upon certain texts in which everlasting or eternal life is set forth as resulting from *faith*. If such life were the *immortal* life, it would be an apparently fair conclusion that, on the death of the body, non-believers would drop into non-existence. But everlasting or eternal life is certainly not the immortal life; for we certainly may possess such life while in a state of mortality. Says Jesus, "He who heareth my word, and believeth on Him who

* Not the common rendering.

[1] Luke xxi. 34. [2] 2 Pet. ii. 12; Jude 8-13.
[3] Rev. xxi. 4, 8; xiv. 9-11.

sent me, *hath* everlasting life." "This is life eternal that they might know Thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom Thou hast sent." [1]

It would seem that all human beings possess a spiritual as well as an animal nature; and that a state of spiritual advancement, or, as some would express it, of spiritual development, is what is meant in Scripture by having everlasting or eternal life; also, that to be in a state of spiritual inactivity or inertness, is what is meant by being in a state of death. (See Chap. vi.) This death, however, is no where, in the Scriptures, denominated "eternal" or "everlasting."

As regards the position that no one will have immortal life who does not first obtain eternal life, it may be observed that were this proved, it would by no means follow, Scripturally, that any are to be annihilated; for

In the same chapter where we read that "by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin, and so death passed upon all men for that all have sinned," we truly *may* also read, that "where sin abounded, grace did much more abound; that as sin hath reigned to death, even so might grace reign, through righteousness, unto eternal life, by Jesus Christ our Lord." [2] As the one, even so the other. As extensive as is the reign of sin, even so extensive shall be the reign of grace. Eternal life, then, is ultimately to be the inheritance of all.

[1] John v. 24; xvii. 3. [2] Rom. v. 20, 21.

## CHAPTER X.

### THE DEATH OF THE SOUL.

It has been taught, as a Christian doctrine, that the human soul or spirit is specifically mortal, so that, on the death of the body, all which constitutes man what he is, dies; (a doctrine none the less true, nor any more so, because thus much of it was believed, of old, by the Sadducees;) and that mankind, thus dying, body and spirit, will remain thus dead until some period yet future, when all will be made alive simultaneously.

The doctrine of the literal death of the human spirit, though attended, as a compensatory consideration, with that of the spirit's revivification, I can not receive, because of the following, among other reasons:

1. Viewed in the light of the above-stated doctrine, life after death is the same as a new creation — is equivalent to the making of new beings. And since this is not at all calculated to gratify one's own inherent love of individual, personal life, the prospect of a future life, contemplated thus, loses nearly all its interest. To me, therefore, this doctrine seems very little like gospel.

The giving of existence to that which has *no* existence, is clearly an act of creation; and this

would be equally true, whether the recipient of existence had, or had not, existed previously. Thus, unless it is indeed true that the mortal body once inhabited by Adam, is now in existence, *as a corpse*, or, at least, as a *mummy*, the creating of that body at the first, was no more certainly a creative act, than would be the giving of existence to that same body now. But it is a contradiction in terms, this speaking of Adam's body, supposedly now created, as being the same one he had in the days of his flesh, and which, doubtless, was dissolved thousands of years ago. In order for the body of a man to live a second time and *be* the same body it was at first, it must constantly have retained its previous existence.

So, also, with the spirit. If the spirit dies, and will afterward live, and be the same spirit it was, its existence, as a spirit, must remain perfect and entire in the interim. But I have never seen or heard an argument from either Scripture or nature demonstrating that the spirit of man, if literally dead, would necessarily continue to exist for even a moment.

To assert that the soul or spirit of man is *material*, which is to say that it is composed of matter; and to assert also that matter, in all circumstances, is positively indestructible; and to argue thence that the soul or spirit must always exist; would be an argument of no force whatever, even though the premises were indubitably proved. In precisely the same way, and with quite as much propriety, might be argued the endless existence of *every* thing material, — which would be glaringly absurd. For though it were demonstrable, and even self-evident, that not a particle of matter ever was, or ever will be annihilated, this could not neutralize, much less

annihilate the fact, that material structures are undergoing annihilation every day.

2. In the second place, as I understand the Scriptures, the opposite of this doctrine is taught therein in the clearest manner. To me, the Saviour, in His conversation with the Sadducee Doctors, "as touching the dead," &c., lays down the position, as being both an Old and a New-Testament doctrine, that there are no human dead in any other than a merely physical sense, for that all the so-called dead are spiritually "living."

The Sadducees, as we have before seen, held that the souls or spirits of men die with their bodies. Our Lord, having replied to their question, introduces a Scriptural incident as a ground of argument; and it is apparent that His after-remarks are intended as a refutation of their distinguishing opinions, rather than as an answer to any thing they are reported to have then said:

"As touching the dead, that they rise: [or "are raised:"] have ye not read in the book of Moses, how in the bush God spoke to him, saying, 'I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob?' He is not the God of the dead, but of the living: ye therefore do greatly err." Mark xii. 26, 27. (See also the parallel passages in Matthew and Luke.)

When Jehovah, through an angel, said to Moses, "I am the God of Abraham," &c., it was after those patriarchs had died, in the ordinary sense of speaking. And yet He did not say, "I *was* their God," but "*I am*," in the then present tense. Now the term "God" denotes an object of *worship;* and it as truly, and as necessarily, implies worshipper, as master implies servant. The fact, then, that God said to Moses, "I am," &c., using the present tense, (or rather that which, in Hebrew, is fully equivalent to it — the *ellipsis* of the verb, as, "I

the God," &c.,) shows incontestibly that, according to the Scriptures, Abraham and the other patriarchs named in the account, though at that time dead, as to their bodies, were nevertheless truly living. Not merely existing, but living, or alive. And if they, why not others? *why not all?* Indeed, as we learn indisputably from Luke, the Saviour himself actually applied His argument to the whole race, declaring, "For HE is not a God of the dead, but of the living; for *all* live to HIM."[1]

I claim, then, that the doctrine in question is disproved by Scriptural facts, as presented and illustrated by Him who "brought life and immortality to light."

I know of but few Scripture texts which can be brought in proof of this doctrine with any show of applicancy. It is indeed said, "Man dieth;" and as the word man *may* include in its meaning both body and soul, this text may be thought to teach the doctrine of total death. But it is proper to observe that the text reads, "man dieth, and *wasteth away*." Does Job here mean that the soul or spirit dies with the body? If so, he must also mean that, after its death, the soul or spirit *wastes away* as does the body, and so becomes dissolved.

The latter half of the verse claims a moment's attention, as being explanatory of the former half, by the *parallelism* common in Hebrew poetry. The whole reads thus:

> "But man dieth and wasteth away;
> Yea, man giveth up the ghost, and where is he?"

To die, in the first line, is the same as giving up the ghost in the second; and as that which yields

[1] Luke xx. 38.

up the ghost, is certainly the body, therefore that which dies, is the body. The question in the second line, "where is he?" is obviously not a call for information, but is equivalent to saying, he is not; and it corresponds to the phrase in the first line, "wasteth away." And as it is evidently the body that wastes away, so it is the body, or, in other words, man, as a visible, tangible entity, concerning which or whom it is asked, "where is he?" the implied answer to which is manifestly this, "He is gone — he is wasted away — he is not." Job continues:

"As the waters fail from the sea, and the flood decayeth, and drieth up: So man lieth down, and riseth not: till the heavens be no more, they shall not awake, nor be raised out of their sleep." Job xiv. 7–12.

If in the above passage Job has reference to a mode of being other than the present, then he certainly declares, in opposition to the Christian Scriptures, that there is not, and will not be, any resurrection at all. To me, however, he merely declares, in opposition to the doctrine of *transmigration*, that when a man is once dead he lives no more here — that death is a perpetual sleep so far as living again in this state of mortality is concerned. Says he, "There is hope of a *tree*, if it be cut down, that it will sprout again, . . . . . But *man* dieth, and wasteth away, . . . . man lieth down, and riseth not."

There is an other text demanding our particular consideration here — the text which instructs us that, at least in some instances, men's "thoughts perish" at death. Let it be assumed — as it has been — that, in this text, the word "thoughts" signifies the faculty of thinking, and the doctrine

under examination will seem to be pretty plainly proved. But it may not be unprofitable to consider, that

By a man's thoughts are more usually meant his ideas, that is, the things which are thought by him; as his desires, designs, expectations, and the like. In one text, we read, "Commit thy works to the Lord, and thy *thoughts* shall be established." Thy designs or calculations. It is said of some, "Their inward *thought* is, that their houses shall continue for ever." Such a thought or expectation must most certainly have perished; yet that in the thinkers of the thought the power of thinking has perished, does by no means necessarily follow.[1]

In like manner, a man may think —, may desire, design, calculate, plan, expect, — to leave, when he dies, a vast amount of *money* to his *children;* but he may die moneyless, or childless, or both; and in such case, such thought will perish, of course; yea, this must happen in the very day that he dies, if not sooner; — yet it is not therefore certain that the man's *thinking faculty* will perish, or be even suspended.

The passage embracing the text in question, reads thus:

"Put not your trust in princes, nor in the son of man, in whom there is no help. His breath goeth forth, he returneth to his earth; in that very day *his thoughts* perish. Happy is he who hath the God of Jacob for his help, whose hope is in the Lord his God." Psalms cxlvi. 3--5.

The sense of the above passage I take to be, substantially, as follows: Trust in God, rather than in man, for even princes die, and when dead can do nothing for you. Death *brings to nought* their designs and plans. It is an appropriate exhorta-

[1] Prov. xvi. 3; Psalms xlix. 11.

tion, Put not your trust in any son of man, for he will die, and his plans perish ; but Trust not in man, for he will die, and his thinking power perish, is saying nothing suitable to the case over and above the mention of man's mortality. Does any one imagine that the Psalmist thought we might advantageously depend on kings after their decease, provided they but retained the power of thinking?

N. B. Some of the objections presented in this chapter, are effective against some form of the doctrine examined in the previous chapter. Also, some of the Scriptures which will be considered in the second chapter from this, are likely to be occasionally cited in support of the doctrine examined in the present chapter.

It is freely admitted that the Scriptures no where say that the soul or spirit of man is *immortal;* and it is a fact, also, that it is not said in that Book that the soul or spirit is *incorruptible.* But as no one would infer from the latter fact that the spirit is subject to *putrefaction,* — so I, for one, do not infer from the former fact that the spirit literally dies. The truth is, that, scripturally, man's immortality is predicated of his spiritual body, and his mortality, of his animal body.

## CHAPTER XI.

### THE SLEEP OF THE SOUL.

It is held by some, that, on the death of the body, the soul or spirit sinks into a state of sleep — that the dead of the present and all past generations are reposing in blank and dreamless unconsciousness, to be aroused at some future time, along with those of all future generations, at which period the entire race of man, from Adam to the last of his posterity, shall recommence conscious existence at the same moment.

In disproof of this doctrine, I propose to present, in this and the subsequent chapter, certain scriptural facts and statements, with some reasonings therefrom, which, if the reader please, he may consider as directed not only against this, but against the doctrine examined in our last chapter also.

Certain circumstances connected more or less intimately with our Lord's *transfiguration*, afford a strong argument against the continued sleep of the soul.

By combining and comparing the accounts given by Matthew, Mark, Luke, and Peter, the incident alluded to seems to have been, substantially, as follows: [1]

[1] Matt. xvii. 1-9; Mark ix. 2, 10; Luke ix. 28-36; 2 Peter i. 16-18.

Not many weeks previous to the Saviour's crucifixion, and in about one week after first plainly announcing to the twelve his approaching sufferings, death, and resurrection, He took with him his three confidential disciples, Peter, James, and John, and ascending a high mountain, (for that particular region,) to a place away from any line of travel, and not exposed to view from any inhabited point in the surrounding country, he engaged for a time in special prayer, as was his custom in view of any special event about to happen in his public career. In the course of his devotions, a sort of *sleep* came upon his three attendants; (perhaps from the advent of spiritual beings, though as yet unseen by the disciples;) and on its passing off, these were very greatly surprised at observing that the general appearance of His countenance was most marvelously changed; that his face shone as with the brilliancy of the sun; and that even his *clothing* glistened with a lustre not of earth. And presently observing also, that two men, of like shining appearance, were with him, who — they soon learned — were no other than "Moses and Elias," their surprise and wonder became mingled with the profoundest reverence and awe. These emotions, however, were, in a little time, nearly absorbed in a feeling of intense curiosity and agitating concern, on their perceiving that the topic of conversation between their Master and the two visitants, was His "decease" or departure, and that this was soon to be accomplished at Jerusalem, as indeed he had so lately apprized them. Thus somewhat awe-stricken, but as yet unterrified, the wandering disciples very naturally remained silent, until the conversation closed, and the men were departing, — when Peter, with characteristic forwardness, essayed to hold forth upon the interest-

ing nature of the occasion, and the benefits to be derived from the interview, but finished up his speech much sooner than he anticipated, and, apparently, in a very different manner from what he had intended. For in the very commencement of his opening remarks, as he was saying, "Master, it is good for us to be here," a bright, strange-looking *cloud* swiftly approached, which, in a moment more, completely shut down over them; and so the speaker ended with "and ——," and a proposal to build three booths or tabernacles, talking, as it were, mechanically. And now occurred a most impressive event. A *voice* issued from out the cloud. "This is My beloved Son," — it said, — "in whom I am well pleased; hear ye him." The disciples' agitation and fear were now so great that they bowed forward to the ground, and could not even look up. Jesus presently came and touching them, said, "Arise, and be not afraid." They raised themselves up, and looked around; — the visitors, cloud and all, were gone; — no one was in sight but Jesus and themselves.

The presence of Moses and Elias on the Mount of Transfiguration, seems to be positive proof that they were not, at that time, in a state of sleep. And if not then, why now? And if they are awake, why not others? why not all?

That at the time of their disappearance from among men, both Moses and Elijah did actually experience either the death of the body, or a change fully equivalent to it, is a position easily sustained. Thus the Scripture, over and over again, declares the fact of Moses' death; and we are even told that he was "buried" in a certain "valley," though his "sepulchre," or place of interment, was unknown at, and up to, the time when the account of his death was appended to his writings.

(See as referred to below. [1]) And the doctrine of the soul's sleep teaches that the departed remain until the resurrection in a state of unconsciousness; also, that there had been no resurrection to immortality previous to that of Christ, which, as all are aware, was *after* the transfiguration. Hence, according to this doctrine, if, on being taken up from earth, the prophet Elijah —, otherwise called Elias, — did not undergo bodily death, or its equivalent, he must have come upon the mountain in the same mortal, corruptible body, of flesh and blood, that he had in the days of King Ahab. So, also, if Moses did not literally die, *he*, too, was there in a like condition. But that either was there in such a state, is believed by no one.

Since, then, both Moses and Elijah evidently experienced bodily death, or its equivalent; and since both of them were certainly present at the transfiguration, and were neither of them in a state of sleep; the argument is, that the departed are all in a conscious state. And this argument would not be materially weakened, if, on account of Elijah's having been taken up from earth miraculously, his case were dropped from the premises, and the conclusion drawn from Moses' case alone.

To avoid the above conclusion, some have taken the position that Moses and Elias were not really present at our Lord's transfiguration. In support of this, they insist upon the fact that, according to Matthew, Jesus called the whole scene a *vision*, saying, "Tell the vision to no man, until," &c. To this I reply, that the word "vision" is as properly applied to real as to unreal sights. Indeed, its primitive reference is to things actually seen with

[1] Deut. xxxi. 14; xxxii. 49, 50; xxxiii. 1; xxxiv. 5, 7; Josh. i. 1, 2.

the natural eye. The import of the word, in the text alluded to, is therefore to be learned from the circumstances of the case, and the language of the other Scripture writers who mention the occurrence.

1. The vision of the transfiguration was not a *dream*, whatever else it may have been; for Luke expressly tells us that when "they saw His glory, and the two men who stood with him", the disciples "were awake." If, then, the events witnessed by them were not real, the disciples must have been in a sort of psychological trance.

2. Peter, in speaking of the change in our Lord's appearance, says, "We . . . . . were eye-witnesses of His majesty," — which evinces that, in his estimation, so much, at least, was a reality.

3. Concerning the *voice* mentioned, Peter instructs us that Jesus "received from God, the Father, honor and glory, when there came such a voice to him from the excellent glory." The voice, then, was really heard by Christ, at the least; and moreover it must have been real, else how could He have received honor and glory thereby?

4. Peter further says, "This voice which came from heaven *we* heard when we were with Him in the holy mount." He claims, then, that he and the two other disciples heard the voice as truly as they were with Jesus on the mountain. It is evident, then, that at the time of their hearing it the disciples were *not* in a trance state.

5. Matthew, Mark, and Luke, all inform us that the men *talked* with Jesus; that is, they addressed him, and he them, in turn. This, alone, would go very far toward establishing the reality of their presence. Did He talk to mere phantoms? Did He imagine that they talked to Him? If He *did*

thus imagine, would the disciples also imagine the same things?

6. And lastly, Mark and Luke do not employ the word "vision," but make use of language unequivocally descriptive of real events. The former tells us that Jesus charged the disciples to "tell no man *what thing they had seen* until the Son of man were risen from the dead;" and the latter assures us that they "told no man in those days *any of those things which they had seen.*" The vision, then, was a reality; and Moses and Elias were each there, *in propria persona;* and the argument based upon their appearance is valid and conclusive.

The "bright cloud" which overshadowed them, into which the men seem to have entered, and out from which the voice proceeded as from the Supreme Father, was clearly the same as is called in the Old Testament "the glory of the Lord," — which "glory" abode upon Mount Sinai while Moses was gone up thither, — enveloped and filled the tabernacle when it was first set up, and afterward filled the temple when it was finished, — and appeared publicly, on various occasions, in the early times of the Jewish church.[1] This "bright" or luminous cloud was all along regarded as the symbol of the Divine presence; and in accordance with this is the fact that the *voice*, which the three evangelists all inform us came "out of the cloud," Peter describes as proceeding "from the excellent *glory.*" By the way, this is a strong proof of the reality of the whole of the vision. The so-called "glory of the Lord," when seen in the early times,

[1] Ex. xxiv. 15–18; xl. 34–38; 1 Kings viii. 10, 11; Lev. ix. 6, 23; Ezek. i. 28; and other places.

was obviously seen by the natural eye, and *not* by going into the trance state.

With this view of the subject, we may also perceive a very good reason for our Saviour's retiring with the disciples "up into a high mountain apart by themselves;" for the glory of the Lord, whenever it appeared in the Old Testament times, seems to have been as visible to all as would have been any other object of like brightness and magnitude, in the same situation; and the design of God, in this case, seems to have been, that no one should then witness its appearance, with the accompanying events and visitants, except Jesus and the three disciples.

"The major includes the minor." If Moses and Elias were *awake* at the time of their appearance, they of course were *alive*, though their bodies had been dead for centuries. Their appearance, therefore, furnishes an irrefragable argument against the correctness of the doctrine examined in our last chapter.

## CHAPTER XII.

### THE SLEEP OF THE SOUL—CONCLUDED.

When Jesus was discoursing with his disciples just prior to his apprehension, he said, "Little children, yet a little while I am with you. Ye shall seek me; and *as I said to the Jews*, 'Whither I go ye can not come,' so now I say to *you*."[1] Observing the effect of this announcement upon their minds, he, after a few other remarks, added as follows:

"Let not your heart be troubled: . . . . . In my Father's house are many mansions: if it were not so, I would have told you. I go to prepare a place for you. And if I go and prepare [, better, "when I shall have gone and prepared"] a place for you, I will come again, and receive you to myself; that where I am, there ye may be also." John xiv. 1–3.

It is scarcely supposable that the Saviour's meaning in the above passage was really to the effect that in his Father's house are many sleeping-rooms; and that he was going thither to fit up an apartment for his apostles to repose in, through a long, long night of unconsciousness, which was to intervene between the time of their deaths and the far-off morning of a yet future resurrection. But what less could He have meant, if the doctrine under examination was really *His* doctrine?

The apostles were at that time in His company—in the enjoyment of His society; but He had

[1] John xiii. 33; vii. 34; viii. 21.

just notified them that he was about to leave them, and to go where they could not follow him. For their comfort, therefore, he assures them that he will come again, and will himself conduct them to his heavenly Father's house, that they may again be with him. Now, laying preconceived opinions aside, does it not really seem as though the Saviour intended to be understood as promising them that when they should again be where He would be, they should again enjoy his society? And how could they do this, unless they should be in a conscious state?

That the primitive Christians did not expect to remain in an unconscious state for a long term of time before being received by their ascended Master, is clearly indicated by the circumstance that *Stephen*, on being favored with a view of Him in heaven, exclaimed, while being stoned to death, "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit." Query. Is it to be believed that this, the dying petition of the first Christian martyr, has not yet been granted?

At the close of the parables of the one lost sheep and the lost piece of silver, the Saviour avers that there is "joy" "in heaven," "in the presence of the angels of God, over one sinner that repenteth."[1] Observe, here, that our Lord's affirmation is *not* that *the angels* rejoice over the repentant sinner — (this, though by no means incredible, but quite the reverse, He neither affirms nor denies —) what He affirms is precisely this, that there is joy in their *presence*. But this affirmation of His most clearly *implies* — what almost any person not asleep is abundantly capable of perceiving — that, at that time, there were beings in heaven who not only were not angels, but

[1] Luke xv. 7, 10.

were in some sense inferior to angels, being in their presence, in like manner as — in Luke i. 19 — the angel Gabriel claims to "stand" habitually "in the presence of God." And it is as clearly implied also, that such beings, other and somewhat "lower than the angels," are the ones who the Saviour would have us understand were affected with "joy" at the repentance of sinners. But if Adam and Eve, and all their then deceased posterity, were at that very time in a state of profound sleep, and had been ever since their deaths, who could those "joy" affected beings have been?

Says Paul to the brethren at Philippi, "I am in a strait betwixt two, having a desire to depart, and to be with Christ; which is far better: nevertheless to abide in the flesh is more needful for you."[1] He was thus *willing* to abide here a while longer, yet rather *desirous* to depart. While remaining in the flesh, he would enjoy at least the satisfaction of doing good by his active labors in the cause of Christ; — can it be, then, that he was really and understandingly desirous of entering upon a condition characterized by an entire suspension of enjoyment, as well as of activity?

The apostle was not merely a thoughtful man — he was an active, vigorous thinker. Could he possibly, then, consider it so very "far better" than the present life, to go into a state of thoughtless sleep for a series at least of years? being indeed "with Christ," in the sense of being laid away for repose in that particular department of the universe inhabited by Christ, yet totally incapable of enjoying even that fact, because unconscious of it? — unconscious even of the Saviour's existence, yea, of the existence of God,

[1] Phil. i. 23, 24.

and indeed that there was then such a being as himself, or ever had been? I confess I think not.

In an other place, the same apostle declares as follows:

"Therefore we are always confident, knowing that whilst we are at home in the body, we are absent from the Lord. (For we walk by faith, not by sight.) We are confident, I say, and willing rather to be absent from the body, and to be present with the Lord." 2 Cor. v. 6–8.

Observe, here, that it was while the Christians were absent from the Lord they had to walk by faith instead of sight — the time when they could not *see* the Saviour, but had to be content with *believing* in him, was while they were in the body. And why should the apostle throw in that parenthesis, — ("we walk by faith, not by sight,") — unless he meant to give them the idea that when they should come to be present with Christ they would be privileged to walk by sight, and *not* alone by faith? According to Paul, then, the early believers would not only be *with* the Saviour on leaving the body, but when with him would be quite *aware* of the fact.

As regards *seeing*. Christ in his glorified state, take the following from the beloved disciple, observing that John sometimes uses a *pronoun* to designate the Saviour, without havin- first used the appropriate noun. The rendering given varies somewhat from that in the Common Version, being more literal, and —, as is believed, — more correct.

"Beloved, now are we children of God; but what we shall be, has not yet been manifested; we know, however, that, when it shall have been manifested, we shall be like Him, for we shall see Him as He is." 1 John iii. 2.

Those seeing, must certainly know something; and those knowing any thing, are, of course, in a

conscious state. How can we rationally, then, receive as a Scripture doctrine, that form of faith which teaches that when we leave the body we fall into a state of total insensibility and utter dormancy, which may last for perhaps thousands and thousands of years, during all which time we shall sleep, and sleep, and sleep, in wakeless, dreamless, motionless hibernation, not even for one instant knowing enough to know that we — know not any thing.

The query may now arise, Is not the writer aware that the Scripture declares, in just the words used by him, that *the dead* "know not any thing"? I reply, I am perfectly aware of it. It was for the special purpose of calling attention to the text alluded to, that I employed its particular phraseology, instead of the stronger and more natural expression, "know nothing."

I defer to the authority of the Scriptures; but, like every other Bible man, I receive Scripture testimony "as I understand it."

In interpreting a Scripture text, there is danger of mistaking the topic upon which the writer is treating, and so of being led into erroneous conclusions by the mere sound of words. Thus,

The same Bible which teaches, unequivocally, that "in Christ shall all be made alive," as also that "there shall be a resurrection of the dead," universally, declares just as plainly concerning certain persons, "They are dead, they shall not live; they are deceased, they shall not rise." [1] This *sounds* as if teaching that some shall not live after death; — shall not rise after their decease; — but is it truly a Scripture doctrine that some of mankind

[1] 1 Cor. xv. 22; Acts xxiv. 15; Isa. xxvi. 14.

have no existence after death? Most certainly not. The text just quoted has reference simply to living again on the earth — to rising into this mode of being.

So the Psalmist asks, "Shall the dead arise and praise thee"? the implied answer to which is, No, by no means. Yet we should by no means understand the writer as denying the rising of the dead in the Christian sense. He was evidently speaking of arising, that is, of getting up from a reclining posture, to join in the worship of God here on earth. Compare a passage from the prophet in which it is said, "The living, the living, he shall praise thee, as I do this day:" &c.[1]

But to return to the text from Ecclesiastes, "The dead know not any thing." Though the expression, "the dead" has reference commonly to persons, considered as spiritual beings, I am fully convinced that here, as in a few other places, it refers to the visible dead; and that its sense is, Dead bodies are destitute of knowledge. That it has no reference to aught beyond this mode of being, is apparent from several considerations:

1. The passage of which this noted text forms a part, *closes* thus: "Neither have they any more a portion for ever in any thing that is done *under the sun*." This language unmistakably relates to matters and things in the present mode of being.

2. In the context, a few verses previous to the text under consideration, "the business that it done upon the earth" is expressly mentioned.

3. Immediately succeeding the text, occurs the following: "Neither have they any more a reward: for the memory of them is forgotten." Forgotten by whom? If by persons in this state

[1] Ps. lxxxviii. 10; Isa. xxxviii. 18--20.

of being, then the absence of reward belongs to this state of being; for *our* forgetfulness of the dead, or of their deserts, is no reason for the absence of reward in an hereafter state. The passage, then, can not consistently be interpreted as expressive of the condition of the departed in an other life, unless we adopt the monstrous conclusion that the spirits of such, (or perhaps the doings of such,) are forgotten by HIM from Whom their spirits proceeded, and *to* Whom, as even the preacher assures us, they are destined at length to return.[1]

4. As a further proof that the reference of the passage is to the present mode of being, observe that a few verses after it, the Preacher holds forth thus: "Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might." It is well-nigh indisputable that, in this place, the preacher is exhorting to diligence in the ordinary business of life. He accordingly adds, as an incentive to diligence, "for there is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom, in the grave whither thou goest."[2] As if he had said that the common laborer, the mechanic, the professional man, and the philosopher, all cease their accustomed pursuits at death.

The passage embracing the text in question, reads thus:

"For to him who is joined to all the living, there is hope: for a living dog is better than a dead lion. For the living know that they shall die: but the dead know not any thing, neither have they any more a reward: for the memory of them is forgotten. Also their love, and their hatred, and their envy, are now perished, neither have they any more a portion for ever in any thing that is done under the sun." Eccl. ix. 4-7.

The sense of the above, (omitting one clause,) I take to be substantially as follows:

[1] Eccl. xii. 7. [2] Eccl. ix. 10.

As long as a man has life, there is hope of his being in some way useful; for as a dog that is alive is better than a lion that is dead, so the most insignificant of our race, if living, is of more real importance in the world than the lifeless body of even the greatest monarch. For any live man knows enough to know that he shall die; but a *corpse* knows nothing; neither are such the subjects of recompense * * *. Also, the likes, and the dislikes, and the other emotions common to men, they are destitute of; neither have they any part, or interest, in any worldly business whatever.

In perfect accordance with the above interpretation, is the declaration, "Neither have they any more a reward." The word "reward," in the Scriptures, has the sense of "recompense," being applied to punishments, as well as to rewards, in the modern sense of the term. "Woe to the wicked!" says the prophet, "it shall be ill with him: for the reward of his hands shall be given him." [1] Rewards, in at least this sense, are often inflicted upon the *bodies* of transgressors; but rarely upon *dead* bodies. In regard to such inflictions, it is, in general, as if a dead man's deeds were forgotten. So, also, as to their having no more any part or portion in what is "done under the sun." The bodies of men, while alive, have a great deal to do with such doings; but this all ceases at death. Solomon is set forth in the Scriptures as having been an exceedingly *wise* man, but he is *not* therein recognized as a prophet. He was unquestionably a philosopher, but certainly was not an apostle. It therefore seems quite unlikely that he should have undertaken to describe the condition of departed spirits. And if he really

[1] Isaiah iii. 11.

did attempt this in the passage we have been considering, and especially if he was divinely inspired so to do, is it not passing strange that his teachings on the subject are not quoted nor alluded to in all the Christian Scriptures, and that neither Jesus Christ, nor his apostles, ever put forth any thing resembling such teachings?

It may now be asked, Do we not read in the Scriptures of persons' falling asleep, sleeping, and being asleep, when the meaning is that they died, or were dead? Certainly. Yet this fact, so far from supporting the doctrine under examination, goes directly to subvert it. Such expressions relate solely to the death of the body. See chap. ii.

No where, in the Scriptures, do we read that the souls or spirits of the dead either sleep or die, in even a figurative sense. It is the spirits of those in the flesh who are liable to get into this condition: "Awake, thou who sleepest," says the Scripture, "and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give thee light." [1]

In one place we indeed learn that when the Lord Jesus shall himself descend from heaven, those "who sleep in Jesus will God bring with him." [2] This may seem to teach that at the time of their descent, the spirits of such persons will be *asleep.* Common sense, however, most clearly teaches that this could not well be the case; and it is proper to know that the passage, literally rendered, teaches — not that they will then "sleep," or be "asleep," but — simply that they will *have* "fallen asleep," that is, will have died. See last chapter of this work.

[1] Eph. v. 14. [2] 1 Thes. iv. 14.

## CHAPTER XIII.

### THE RESURRECTION OF THE EARTHLY BODY.

It has been a commonly received doctrine in the Christian Church for many centuries, believed and advocated by very many great and good men, that the Christian resurrection is specifically the re-uniting of soul and body. It is held that the very same bodies we inhabit here are to be forthcoming at the resurrection; though it is also held that these same bodies will then be "spiritual." The popular idea is, that the body is to rise entire from the grave; (as though every body had been buried;) the learned view of the case, is that the bodies we shall take on at the resurrection are to be formed out of the very same atoms of matter which now constitute our present ones.

The re-union of the souls and bodies of all the dead at the sounding of the archangel's trumpet, has been a somewhat fruithful theme of pulpit declamation. In "The Columbian Orator," a *School* Book of half a century ago, occurs — on pp. 98, 99 — a fine specimen of this sort of rhapsodizing, partly after the declaimer's own imaginings, partly in prose imitation of a celebrated poet, and partly in the poet's own words. Thus, after speaking of the archangel's utterance as being "a summons not only to dead bodies to rise, but to the souls that once animated them, to appear and to be re-

united to them," the reverend orator goes on as follows:

"This summons shall spread through every corner of the universe; and Heaven, Earth, and Hell, and all their inhabitants, shall hear and obey. Now, methinks, I see, I hear the earth heaving, charnel houses rattling, tombs bursting, graves opening. Now the nations under ground begin to stir. There is a noise and a shaking among the dry bones. The dust is all alive, and in motion, and the globe breaks and trembles, as with an earthquake, whilst this vast army is working its way through, and bursting into life. The ruins of human bodies are scattered far and wide, and have passed through many and surprising transformations. A limb in one country, and an other in an other; here the head, and there the trunk; and the ocean rolling between.

"But now, at the sound of the trumpet, they shall all be collected, wherever they were scattered; all properly sorted and united, however they were confused; atom to its fellow atom, bone to its fellow bone. Now, methinks, you may see the air darkened with fragments of bodies, flying from country to country, to meet and join their proper parts:

"——— 'Scattered limbs, and all
The various bones, obsequious to the call,
Self-moved, advance; the neck perhaps to meet
The distant head; the legs, the distant feet.
Dreadful to view, see, through the dusky sky,
Fragments of bodies in confusion fly,
To distant regions journeying, there to claim
Deserted members, and complete the frame.
The severed head and trunk shall join once more,
Though realms now rise between, and oceans roar.
The trumpet's sound each vagrant mote shall hear,
And, whether fixed in earth, or free in air,
Shall heed the signal, wafted in the wind,
And not one sleeping atom lag behind.'"

I object to this doctrine, in the first place, for the reason that, as regards mankind in whole, the particular result which it contemplates, however explained, is utterly impossible.

In asserting the impossibility of giving to each human being in the hereafter state, a body composed of the identical atoms of matter which formed his earthly body at death, I do not by any means deny the possibility of doing this with a select number of individuals. Nor is it denied that if God had been pleased so to do, he *might* have so ordered things as that all and each could be re-embodied in the manner this doctrine teaches. But I do deny that, in the present arrangement of things, such a re-embodiment is at all possible to mankind universally.

No natural fact is better established than this, that an entire transformation of matter is going on perpetually. Both vegetables and animals derive a portion of their constituent parts from the mineral kingdom, and ultimately yield it back; the remains of animals furnish no inconsiderable share of the pabulum of the vegetable kingdom; and vegetables, in a direct or an indirect manner, constitute the food of animals almost exclusively. The fields and forests, in many parts, are, as it were, but one vast burying-ground, on which grow grains and grasses, fuel, and fruits, and food in general, over the undistinguished graves of age-forgotten generations. The bodies of the ancients are thus incorporated with those of the moderns; and it is not at all improbable that, in a period sufficiently remote, some one, if not many, of the countless millions of atoms of matter which make up the body of any given human being, *has* helped to form the body of at least one other human being; and it may even do the like again, at some time far enough in the future.

It would doubtless be quite possible for Omniscience and Omnipotence to gather up every individual atom of matter ever having entered into the composition of each of the solids, liquids, and fluids, making up the bodies of all human beings, down to the very instant of their deaths; and it would seem to be equally possible to re-construct distinct and perfect bodies, for a certain number of persons, out of the very atoms of matter, neither less, more, nor different, which made up their former bodies; and especially those atoms belonging to their bodies at death; — yet to do even this last for every individual of the race, can not but be perfectly *im*possible; seeing that in at least a few instances, it must be a fact that as many as one of the atoms of matter belonging to the body of a person, even at the moment of death, has, at some time, belonged also to the body of some other person at death.

But why should those atoms belonging to our bodies at the instant of death, be the only ones selected for our spiritual embodiment? Some of them may not have been incorporated with the earthly body more than an hour or two; perhaps not five minutes; and when they came, others likely departed, after a companionship perhaps of years. Are these new-comers so much more nearly related to the spirit than are the others?

Do those persons who assert the *atomic* identity of our "spiritual" and our "natural" or animal bodies, really consider "whereof they affirm"? The atoms of matter, if not infinitesimally small, are at least indefinitely so; and they are therefore innumerably numerous in — not to say the human body, but — even the smallest visible object. Thus the insect denominated a *mite* is so very diminutive in size that, when looked at with the naked eye, it appears like a particle of dust; and, when thus

viewed, we should hardly suspect it to be a living creature were it not for its manifest power of locomotion. Yet the microscope reveals this astonishing fact, that its body is as perfectly formed, and that it is made up of as many parts, as is the body of a much larger animal. Were one of its *legs* taken off at midway the length of it, such amputated part, though scarcely perceptible by the ordinary unassisted eye, would evidently contain an almost incalculable number of atoms, if being a complicated structure, with several ingeniously formed joints, numerous muscles ot various sizes, &c., &c.; and were it cut up into as many pieces as it would be possible to make out of the corresponding part of an elephant, the number of atoms in each piece would still be literally inconceivable. This, to some, may seem incredible; yet its truth is scientifically demonstrable.

2. In the second place, though the resurrection of the earthly body were in all instances possible, it would seem to be wholly *useless*. Is it claimed that such a proceeding is necessary to our future identity? In the present life, our bodies are constantly changing; yet our consciousness of identity is not in the least impaired thereby. The body of John Smith at 70 years of age may not contain a single atom — or but few atoms, at most — of the matter which formed the body of John Smith at 10; and besides, in the intervening years, his body may have been wholly or mainly changed, five, ten, or twenty times; and yet he is unmistakably conscious of having been the same John Smith all along.

3. In the third place, I object to the doctrine in question as being evidently unscriptural.

In one of Paul's epistles, where he is treating expressly upon "the resurrection of the dead," he

supposes some person to interpose two important questions relating to the dead, the latter of which happens to be the very one now under consideration: "With what body do they come"? The answer of the apostle is significant:

He refers the questioner (, whom he seems to regard as a sneering objector,) to the sowing and springing up of "grain"; and the figure of *sowing*, &c. is kept up throughout his answer. And, leaving out what he says in reply to the other question, as also two or three explanatory remarks, and a half dozen or so of truisms, not necessary to be repeated now and here, his answer is worded thus: "Thou sowest not that body that shall be, . . . . . But God giveth it a body . . . . . So also is the resurrection of the dead . . . . . It is sown a natural body; it is raised a spiritual body." [1] In this passage, the apostle not only omits to put forth the doctrine in question, but seems to state its opposite with entire clearness. See Chap. xxx of this work.

It may perhaps be argued that as Jesus Christ was raised with the body he had before death, and the Scripture says "we shall be like him", therefore our earthly bodies will be raised. On the same principle it might be argued that as His body did not suffer putrefaction, (or, in the Scripture phrase, "saw no corruption,") so neither will ours. But it is believed, on all hands, that, in this last named particular, the circumstances attendant on His resurrection differ very materially from those which will be attendant on ours; and yet that this does not contravene the Scripture which says we shall be like him. Why, then, may we not differ from Him as to the circumstance in question, and

[1] 1 Cor. xv. 35–44.

yet be like him in the proper sense of the Scripture alluded to?

There was doubtless a special reason why our Lord was raised in the manner in which He was. His rising was to furnish the strongest evidence that could then be given of the reality of an after-death existence for man. And as the fact of His rising must be certainly *known* to be a fact, in order to be a suitable and sufficient foundation for so interesting and important a doctrine, it was requisite that ocular, audible, and tangible proof should be given that He had been raised. He therefore put on the same body after as before his demise, — and thus was seen, heard, handled, and fully recognized; so that his personal identity was established beyond the possibility of doubt. But it surely is by no means incredible that within his sensible body he had a spiritual one, such as we are to have when we come to be like him. (See Chap. xxxv.)

There are two texts which may seem to plainly teach the doctrine under examination, provided our preconceptions in its favor are of sufficient strength:

"If the Spirit of Him who raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, He who raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by His Spirit that dwelleth in you." Rom. viii. 11.

The doctrine of the above text is clearly the bestowing — not of immortal, but — of spiritual or religious life, usually characterized as everlasting or eternal. This process is here compared to the revivification or quickening of Christ's fleshly body at His resurrection. The apostle, elsewhere, not only represents this spiritual quickening of believers as having been already accomplished, but

he also couples it with a resurrection, and that with a heavenly state, and the whole in this world:

"And you hath He quickened who were dead in trespasses and sins." "God . . . . . hath quickened us together with Christ . . . . . and hath raised us up together, and made us sit together in heavenly places in Christ." Eph. ii. 1–6.

The second of the two texts alluded to, reads thus:

"For our conversation [or "citizenship"] is in heaven; from whence also we look for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ; who shall change [literally, "will transform"] our vile body, that it may be fashioned like his glorious body, according to the working whereby he is able even to subdue all things to himself." Phil. iii. 20, 21.

A careful comparison of this last text with others from the same apostle, will show with much clearness that the change or transformation mentioned is of the same character as the *quickening* just considered; and also that it may take place in a state of mortality:

"We all . . . . . beholding as in a glass the glory of the Lord, are changed into the same image from glory to glory." 2 Cor. iii. 18.

"I beseech you . . . . . that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable to God . . . . . And be not conformed to this world; but be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind." Rom. xii. 1, 2.

That passage in Ezekiel which tells of a sort of resurrection of a great quantity of "dry bones," has been thought to teach the rising of the earthly body. Yet it seems scarcely possible for an intelligent reader to peruse the account of the vision without perceiving that it is the return of the Jews from their captivity in Babylon, which is therein intended to be set forth. Thus, in the sequel, it is actually said:

"Son of man, these bones are the whole house of Israel: behold, they say, Our bones are dried, and our hope is lost:

. . . . . Therefore prophesy and say to them, Thus saith the Lord God, Behold, O my people, I will open your graves, and cause you to come up out of your graves, and bring you *into the land of Israel.*" Ezek. xxxvii. 1–14.

There is an account in Matthew affording a more plausible argument for the resurrection of the earthly body than any other passage in the sacred volume:

"Jesus, when He had cried again with a loud voice, yielded up the ghost. And, behold, the veil of the temple was rent in twain from the top to the bottom; and the earth did quake, and the rocks [were] rent; and the graves were open; *and many bodies of the saints which slept arose, and came out of the graves after his resurrection, and went into the holy city, and appeared to many.* Now when the centurion, and those who were with him, watching Jesus, saw the earthquake, and those things that were done, they feared greatly, saying, Truly this was the Son of God." Matt. xxvii. 50--54.

The above account, as explicit as it is in respect to the events narrated, does not however prove, or really go to prove, the resurrection of the bodies of *all* the dead, or of all the *saints* even; for the rising of the bodies of those saints was clearly *miraculous;* and the established manner of the resurrection (, I do not say the fact, but the *manner,*) is *not* properly provable by miracles. Let me explain:

"After a storm, comes a calm." The Fact embodied in this proverb, is clearly a Divine appoint ment; as is also the fact revealed in the Scriptures, that "The Dead Rise" or "are Raised." A violent tempest once swept over the surface of a little *lake* upon which Jesus and his disciples were sailing. The foaming billows, tossing themselves on high, threatened a watery grave to all on board. "*A great calm*" immediately followed upon His authoritative command to the winds and waves, "Peace! Be still." This was an astonishing

miracle. It most forcibly exhibited the great power with which that BEING Who rules the winds and waves had invested him; and so went clearly to prove the divinity of his mission, as also the truth of his doctrine. But it needs scarcely be hinted, that the *manner* in which storms in general were to subside into calms thereafter, was *not* thereby shown.

So, though certain bodies of saints are declared to have arisen, and to have come out of the graves, &c., on the occasion of Christ's resurrection, it by no means follows that a like honor awaits the bodies of all our race.

Note. The foregoing remarks upon the passage giving an account of bodies of saints rising, &c., are made upon the admission that the whole of the passage is genuine — as indeed it may be. And yet certain circumstances seem to indicate that that part of it which I have placed in *Italics*, is an interpolation. Thus,

1. In no other place in the New Testament, is the rising of those bodies, with their subsequent movements and manifestations, even alluded to.

2. The account in question has very much the appearance of having been foisted into Matthew's narration; for just before, and just after this account, the evangelist is certainly narrating events which purport to have transpired just before, at, and directly after the time of our Saviour's death; that is, on Friday afternoon; whereas the rising of those saints' bodies, their coming out of the graves, &c., are expressly declared to have happened "*after His resurrection;*" that is, after the dawn of Sunday morning. And the fact now about to be mentioned, may also have some significancy in this connection, that the noun *egersis*, which is here employed in the Greek of the phrase, "after His

resurrection," occurs no where else in the whole New Testament. (See Chap. ii. of this work,)

3. The *exclamation* of the centurion and his men was obviously called forth — not by any thing that occurred after Christ's *resurrection*, but — by what happened at and just after Christ's *death;* and the words of Matthew, that they "saw [that is, 'witnessed'] the earthquake *and* those things that were done," and then exclaimed as they did, seem clearly to show that after saying, "and the earth did quake," he — Matthew — had not made mention of any events which the centurion and his men had not witnessed at the time they thus spoke.

It is at least an allowable conjecture, that Matthew finished the sentence with saying, "and the graves were opened;" or perhaps more properly, "were widened," or "were caused to gape;" (meaning thereby either that the three graves which, perhaps, had been dug near the crosses for the reception of the bodies of Jesus and those crucified with him, were affected in that manner by the earthquake; or else that some other graves in that quarter were thus disturbed;) and that what follows in the latter half of the 52d, and in the whole of the 53d verse, was interpolated at an early day.

## CHAPTER XIV.

### THE DOCTRINE OF TWO RESURRECTIONS.

It is very generally held that there are *two* resurrections of the literally dead, differing in time and quality; the first, of the righteous, to a state of happiness; the second, of the wicked, to a state of misery.

I deem this doctrine erroneous for many reasons, among which are the following:

1. The fifteenth chapter of first Corinthians is a professed dissertation upon the subject of the resurrection; and probably the chapter contains as much of matter directly relating to that subject as does all the rest of the New Testament. Yet in the whole chapter, not the least intimation is given of there being but one sort of resurrection. It is "*the* resurrection of the dead" in general, of which the Apostle treats throughout the chapter.

2. The Epistles of Paul make up about two-sevenths of the New Testament; yet in no part of all these, any more than in the chapter just named, is the least mention made of there being more resurrections than one. It may indeed be claimed, and with some degree of plausibility, that, in *a couple* of passages from his pen, the two-resurrection doctrine is taught by *implication;* yet a perhaps troublesome question may probably intrude

itself: If the great apostle had believed in two resurrections, would he not as much as *once* have stated the doctrine in express terms?

But the common doctrine of two resurrections is not even *implied*, in the writings of Paul, as we shall soon see from an examination of the two texts above alluded to.

In the Epistle to the Hebrews we are told of "a better resurrection," which of course implies an other of a less desirable quality. But the doctrine under examination is not recognised in this text; since its less desirable resurrection is plainly *a bringing back to life in this world.* Says the writer, "Women *received* their dead raised to life again; and others were tortured, not accepting deliverance; that they might obtain a *better* resurrection."[1] A better resurrection than what one? Obviously, than the one he had just mentioned.

In the first part of the text above cited, the writer doubtless alludes to the raising of certain children to life, and the restoring of them to their mothers, by the two prophets, Elijah and Elisha.[2] In the last part, the allusion is not so manifest; but perhaps it is to certain persons mentioned in the *Apocrypha* as having been tortured to death for their adherence to the Jewish religion?[3]

The other text from Paul in which it may be thought that the two-resurrection doctrine is taught by implication, is that one where we read that "the dead in Christ shall rise first." Yet any one, by consulting the passage, may perceive, unmistakably, that no second rising of any *dead* is there implied; since the contrast is *not* between the dead in Christ and some other class of dead,

[1] Hebrew xi. 35.
[2] 1 Kings xvii. 17–24; 2 Kings iv. 32–37.
[3] 2 Maccabees vii. 9–36; xiv. 46.

but between the dead there mentioned and some others who, at a certain period, were to be "alive;" "The dead in Christ shall rise first: then we who are alive and remain shall be caught up," &c.[1]

It is apparent, then, that

The common doctrine of two resurrections receives no support from the testimony of the Apostle to the Gentiles, so far as the same may be gathered from his numerous Epistles.

3. In accordance with the foregoing, is the fact that this same apostle, when arraigned before the Roman governor Felix, testifies of having "hope toward God . . . . that there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust."[2] In this text, so far from saying any thing of two resurrections, the one of the just, and the other of the unjust, he puts the word anastasis in the singular number, and then tells us that *it* includes "both" the classes mentioned, which is to say, the just and the unjust taken together. "There shall be *a* resurrection" — are his words — "*both* of the just and unjust."

4. Our Lord, in his conversation with the Sadducees upon the resurrection, makes no mention of more resurrections than one. This he denominates "the resurrection of the dead" — not of the righteous dead, nor of any particular class of dead whatever, but "of the dead" — a fact not easily accounted for on the supposition that He recognized two literal resurrections for the literally dead.

It may be replied to this, that, according to Luke, the resurrection our Lord taught in his conversation with the Sadducee Doctors, was for those only "who shall be accounted worthy;" which lan-

[1] 1 Thes. iv. 16, 17. [2] Acts xxiv. 15.

guage implies that others shall *not* be thus accounted; and from this it may be argued that for these last there is to be an other resurrection. I answer,

The language above quoted indeed implies that at some time some shall not be accounted worthy; but it by no means implies that this shall be the case always. If, however, it were a fact that this implied unworthiness were even declaredly perpetual, the claiming of any resurrection at all for such unworthy persons, is the last thing that should be thought of; since the worthiness mentioned has particular reference to rising or *not* rising. "To be, or not to be," &c.

Christ's words are as follows, according to the Common Version:

"The children of this world" —— which is to say, mankind in the present mode of being —— "marry," &c.; "but those who shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world, and the resurrection from the dead, neither marry, nor are given in marriage: neither can they die any more; for they are equal to [or 'like'] the angels; and are the children of God, being the children of the resurrection." Luke xx. 34–36.

Now, if some of our race shall never "be accounted worthy to obtain that world and the resurrection" taught by Christ, they must, for aught that appears, be never inhabitants of any other world than this; and they must either perish at death, or, if raised at all, must be the subjects of a Pharisaic resurrection, that is, to a state of mortality on this earth. For not being "the children" of the Christian resurrection, they can not be "children of God;" they can not be "equal to [*or* like] angels," that is, spiritual beings; nor does the passage affirm concerning the *un*worthy, that they do not marry. Indeed, the declaration, "Neither can they die any more," is made concerning none

but the worthy: hence it is a necessary inference that if any shall remain eternally unworthy to obtain what our Lord here mentions, they will either cease to exist at death, as was believed by the Sadducees; or else they will die, and be born, and live, and marry, and die, and so on, like as the Pharisees believed, *ad indefinitum.*

Either, therefore, the doctrine of the Pharisees, or of the Sadducees, is the true one: or else, as certainly as Jesus of Nazareth held the true doctrine, all our race *will* be accounted worthy to obtain the things mentioned by Him, *in due time.*

The foregoing remarks upon the expression, "those who shall be accounted worthy," &c., are made upon the admission, for the time being, that the rendering in the Common Version is correct. That it is so, however, as to the tense of the verb in the phrase here given, is considerably more than doubtful. (See Chap. xxvii.)

There is one other text to be considered in this connection — the text which mentions "the resurrection of the just."

Those accustomed to consider the two-resurrection doctrine as certainly taught in the Scriptures, will, from the force of that preconception alone, be altogether likely to suppose that in the text alluded to a separate resurrection for the unjust is certainly implied; yet the language of the text does not necessarily imply any such thing. Quite as natural an implication, is, that the species of resurrection there intended is of the nature of a reward, and therefore for the just alone.

A resurrection or rising, in the Scriptures, is not always from a state of literal death. Simeon said to the mother of Jesus, "Behold, this child is set for the fall and *rising again* of many in Israel."[1]

[1] Luke ii. 34.

Here the word for "rising again" is *anastasis*, rendered "resurrection" in the text mentioning "the resurrection of the just."

In the verse preceding the passage containing the text under consideration, our Lord says, "He who humbleth himself shall be exalted;" that is, shall be raised, or elevated. Now, may it not be that the rising or resurrection of the just is the same as the exaltation promised by our Lord only a few minutes before, and on the same occasion?[1]

Saint Paul, who claims to have received his doctrine "by the revelation of Jesus Christ,"[2] mentions expressly "*a* resurrection of the dead," as we have seen; and, as we have also seen, he *as* expressly makes this one resurrection to include the rising "*both* of the just and unjust." For this reason, if there were no other, I should *have* to understand the Saviour as intending something other than a rising to immortality when he speaks of the resurrection of the just.

For a brief yet luminous exposition of the passage mentioning "the resurrection of the just" see Paige's Commentary on the New Testament, *in loco*.

In our next chapter, certain passages of Scripture will be considered, in which two resurrections of some sort are undeniably taught.

[1] Luke xiv. 7–14. [2] Gal. i. 12.

## CHAPTER XV.

THE DOCTRINE OF TWO RESURRECTIONS.—CONCLUDED.

THERE are *three* texts of Scripture —, one in the Old Testament, and two in the New, — in which two resurrections, of some sort, are taught in *direct* terms. See Dan. xii. 2; John v. 28, 29; Rev. xx. 4–6. Yet, upon as many as two important points, those texts, if interpreted as referring to the immortal state, disagree irreconcilably in their testimony; nor, if thus interpreted, can they, by any fair means, be made to even *seem* to agree, that is, upon the points alluded to. The rational conclusion therefore is, that the resurrections therein taught are *not* risings into the immortal life; especially, since, with an other interpretation, (which will be herein presented), all disagreement among the texts entirely disappears.

It is true that those texts may be separated from their connections, quoted but in part, and withal considerably *garbled;* and that, thus treated, they may really seem as if certainly teaching the doctrine in question, and this, too, with entire unanimity. But with *fair* treatment, no such doctrine can be deduced from them, or any one of them.

The following is a fair — though moderate — specimen of the unfair (, not to say, dishonest) manner of quotation just alluded to, and quite too often met with:

In John's gospel, the Son of God declares that "all who are in the graves shall hear His voice, and shall come forth; those who have done good, to the resurrection of life; and those who have done evil, to the resurrection of damnation."

The Revelator, in prophetic vision, saw the righteous, that "they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years. But the rest of the dead lived not again until the thousand years were finished." And he adds, "Blessed and holy is he who hath part in the first resurrection: on such the second death hath no power."

In Daniel's prophecy we learn that those "who sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt."

In the above style of quotation, the *contexts* of the passages are *overlooked* entirely; (a rather common proceeding;) and in each text, a highly important member of the sentence is altogether *omitted.* These facts, however, are likely to be unknown to the hearer or reader who has never consulted and compared the passages as they stand in The Book; and such may honestly suppose that two resurrections to immortality, are, by all and each of those texts, most certainly and clearly set forth.

Letting alone, for the present, the less immediate contexts of the passages in hand, let us now test the effect of quoting the omitted phrases:

"*The hour is coming in which* —— *all* who are in the graves shall hear His voice," &c.

"I saw the souls of those who were beheaded for the witness of Jesus, and for the word of God, and who had not worshipped the beast, neither his image, neither had received his mark upon their foreheads, nor in their hands, —— and *they* lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years. But the rest of the dead," &c.

"*At that time* shall Michael stand up, the great prince who standeth for the children of thy people: and there shall be a time of trouble, such as never was since there was a nation even to that same time: and *at that time* thy people shall be delivered, every one who shall be found written in the book. And *many of them* —— who sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake," &c.

We are now prepared to detect at least two glaring *discrepancies* in the testimony of these three texts, that is, ☞ on the supposition that the texts refer to the immortal state.

1. In the Gospel, the two resurrections are to happen in the same "hour." "The hour is coming" — says Christ — "*in which* all who are in the graves shall hear," &c. In the Prophecy likewise, a definite "time" is mentioned, "at" which time the awaking was to take place, both to the one destiny, and to the other. Said the angel to Daniel, "*At that time* thy people shall be delivered," &c. "And many of them who sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt." Yet in the Revelation, *the two risings are separated by an interval of "a thousand years."* "The rest of the dead"—, says the Revelator, — lived not again until the thousand years were finished."

How can the above discrepancy be obviated, except by adopting the well-nigh irresistible conclusion, that at least one of the three texts in mention does *not* refer to the immortal state?

If instead of "hour" in the Gospel, and "time" in the Prophecy, the prophet, and after him the Saviour, had actually employed the word "day," a somewhat plausible atttempt to harmonize their diurnal with the Revelator's millennial period, might — and probaby would — be made, by bringing in, and misinterpreting, the text which declares that "one day is with the Lord as a thousand years, and

a thousand years as one day." But, happily, there is no text which can be tortured into *seeming* to teach that when the Scriptures predict the occurrence of two future events as being both to happen in the same hour, or at the same time, the *real* meaning is that *ten whole centuries* shall elapse *between* them.

Note. If one hour is equivalent to one thousand years, (as must be the case if John v. 28, 29, and Rev. xx. 4–6, are parallel passages, and both of them refer to the immortal state,) why is not one thousand years equivalent to one hour? Surely, the Revelator's time may as well be compressed into the narrow compass of the horary term pointed out by the Saviour, as the Saviour's time be expanded into the rotund area of the millenary cycle described by the Revelator. The Millennium, then, about which so much is said, and upon which so many volumes have been written, may, after all, prove but a brief affair — a Reign of sixty minutes!

2. Being "in the graves," in the Saviour's language, is the same as to "sleep in the dust of the earth," in the phraseology of Daniel. *This must be the case,* if this pair of texts is parallel, whatever may be their true reference. Yet on the supposition that they refer to the immortal state, these texts, though agreeing very well as to time, disagree very materially as to *number;* since the one says "all," and the other says "many of them," which, of course, is *not* all of them. According to the Saviour, "all who are in the graves" shall experience either the one resurrection or the other; but according to Daniel, the most that can be said, is, that "many of them" shall; which obviously implies that at least a few of them shall not. It is certain, then, that

Unless the text in Daniel and that in John are *antagonistic*, only one of the two can have reference to the immortal state. And if either of these does, that in the Revelation does not; hence it is equally certain, that

Of those three texts in which alone two resurrections are expressly mentioned, only one *can* refer to the immortal state.

If, on a fair examination, the weight of evidence does really go to show that one, or two, or even all three, of the texts in hand, really refer to something other than the literal resurrection, the fact ought by no means to be considered an alarming one, much less to be deemed incredible. The doctrine of the future life rests not alone, nor principally, upon texts couched, as these are, in highly figurative language. And, in the Scriptures, not only is the word for "resurrection" employed in more senses than one, as has been already shown; but various kindred Scriptural terms and phrases have a like diversity of signification.

In the 18th and 33d chapters of Ezekiel, a reformation in moral conduct is set forth as in some sort a resurrection; since it is there declared, again and again, that if a man practice wickedness he shall die, and that if he practice righteousness he shall live; and that then, if he turn from his righteousness, and commit iniquity, he shall die; and still, after that, if he will turn from his iniquity, and do that which is right, he shall live.

In Ezekiel 37th chapter, as we have seen, the return of the Jews from their captivity in Babylon is thus promised: "Behold, O my people, I will ..... cause you to come up out of your graves," &c.

In the New Testament, believers in Christ are described

As having "everlasting life";
As having "eternal life";
As having "passed from death to life";
As being "alive from the dead";*
As "risen with Christ;"
As having been "quickened together with Christ";
As having been "raised up together";
As having been made to "sit together in heavenly places, in Christ;"
And so forth, &c.

We even find this spirited exhortation addressed to one in the flesh, "Awake, thou who sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give thee light." Yea, the apostle Paul professed to be striving more earnestly than for any thing else, that he "might attain to the resurrection of the dead." And from his immediately adding, "Not as though I had already attained, or were already perfect," &c., it is manifest that what he was striving for was a something which he deemed attainable in the present mode of being. [1]

If but one of the three texts mentioning two resurrections, really refers to the hereafter life, which one is it? It having been shown that two of them can have no such reference, what is the true showing in regard to the third?

In order to answer the above questions properly, it is necessary to glance at the *contexts* of the three passages alluded to.

The text in Revelation, making the two resurrections to be a full thousand years apart, is so, unlike any other text in the Bible, that supposing we, by some means, had clearly ascertained that *one* of the three texts in hand certainly refers to the hereafter life, this could hardly be thought to be the one. Besides, the context makes the sub-

* "Alive from the dead." This may import "alive among the dead." See Chap. iii.

[1] John vi. 47, 54; 1 John iii. 14; Rom. vi. 13; Coll. iii. 1; Eph. ii. 5, 6; v. 14; Phil. ii. 11.

jects of "the first resurrection," to have been chiefly, if not entirely, the *martyrs* of the early Christian times. "I saw"—, says John,—"the souls of those who were *beheaded* for the witness of Jesus," &c., "and *they* lived and reigned . . . . . But the rest of the dead lived not again until the thousand years were finished. This is the first resurrection." Verily, the prospect of 19th-century Christians for obtaining this high distinction, is small indeed! But who were those "blessed and holy" ones concerning whom it was declared, "on such the second death hath no power"? Undeniably those — *and those only* — having "part in the first resurrection."

The text in Daniel must now be considered. I quote it a second time:

"And at that time shall Michael stand up, the great Prince who standeth for the children of thy people: and there shall be a time of trouble, such as never was since there was a nation even to that same time: and at that time thy people shall be delivered, every one who shall be found written in the book. And many of them who sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt."

Two things in particular are here to be observed:

1. The *time* when those who were sleeping were to awake as described, was to be at — or directly after — the "time of trouble" mentioned. 2. This trouble was to be such that, at the time of its occurrence, the like should never have been since there was a nation. To which add 3. Our Lord, when foretelling the siege and destruction of Jerusalem by the Roman armies, declares, "*Then* shall be great tribulation, [*or* trouble,] such as was not since the beginning of the world to this time, no, nor ever shall be."[1]

[1] Matt. xxiv. 21.

Now, as the trouble prophesied of by Daniel was to be such as, at the time of its happening, had never been, — and as the tribulation or trouble foretold by Christ was to be such as had not been, nor ever should be thereafter, *it* is apparent that the "time of trouble" predicted by Daniel must have been either *at* or *before* the time of the "great tribulation" foretold by Christ, — which is to say, the time of the siege and destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans. Hence the awaking mentioned by Daniel, must have transpired nearly eighteen centuries ago.

*If* any one of the three texts setting forth two resurrections, is to be interpreted as referring to the immortal state, that in John's gospel, announcing a "resurrection of life" and a "resurrection of damnation," must, most certainly, be the one. Let us carefully compare the text with certain portions of the context:

| | |
|---|---|
| Verses 25--27. "Verily, verily, I say to you, The hour is coming, and now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God: and those who hear shall live. For as the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself; and hath given him authority to execute judgment also." | Verses 28--30. "Marvel not at this: for the hour is coming in which all who are in the graves shall hear His voice, and and shall come forth; those who have done good, to the resurrection of life; and those who have done evil, to the resurrection of damnation. I can of my own self do nothing: as I hear, I judge: and my judgment is just." |

It will be seen at a glance, that the phraseology of the passages here set in opposite columns, is to a great extent similar. In the Greek, this similarity is still more observable; since the word rendered "damnation" in the right-hand passage, is the same as is rendered "judgment" at the

close of *each* passage. The import of the two passages is not precisely the same — of course not — else the latter is superfluous. The subject begun in the one is continued and enlarged upon in the other.

The *time* of the left-hand passage is *present*, with an allusion to the past, and a glance at the then future. In it certain facts are announced, with one of the resulting events, and an intimation is given that these are to ultimate in a series. The time of that in the *right*-hand column is *future*, with an allusion to the then present, and a glance at the past. The intimated ultimation is therein described, and direct reference is had to the facts and events with which the series began.

"The hour is coming, and now is." This latter expression, in the left-hand passage, points out not only the time *when* the dead were hearing His voice, but also the place *where;* and it thus shows, unmistakably, that the life after death mentioned in *these* three verses, belongs truly to this mode of being, and to the time and place of Christ's personal ministry, at that. The immortal life is certainly *not* the subject of the passage in the left-hand column.

Why should it be thought that the texts in the right-hand column refer to the immortal life any more than do those in the left? *Life for the dead*, as a result of hearing the voice of the Son of God, is as plainly taught in the left-hand passage as it is in the right; — why, then, is not the reference of the two passages the same?

Again. In verse 24, it is said, "He who heareth my word, and believeth on HIM who sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come [literally, 'is not come'] into condemnation, but is *passed* from death to life." Here, also, *life after death* is

expressly taught; yet no one supposes that this death and the life after it is to be understood in what we call a literal sense. Why, then, in verses 28, 29?

It is pretty evident, thus, from simply a comparison of the text with its context, that John v. 28, 29, refers not to the immortal state. To which add the facts previously presented in this chapter, (not, however, omitting those in the previous chapter upon this subject,) and the matter in proof seems to be rendered entirely certain. I claim, then, to have proved that

Those three texts in which alone two resurrections are expressly mentioned, do not teach, either separately or combinedly, the commonly received doctrine of two resurrections. And I deem it to be a fact, that

The common two-resurrection doctrine is not taught, either expressly or impliedly, in any part of the sacred volume.

A few hints will now be given as to the true import of the three noted texts we have been considering:

The "time of trouble" predicted by Daniel, is the same as the time of "great tribulation" foretold by Christ. This appears, not merely from the similarity of the language used, but also from the staring fact that the language of the context in the one *is professedly quoted* in the context of the other. Thus in Daniel, both before and after the text alluded to, mention is made by him of "the abomination that maketh desolate;" and where our Lord foretells the "great tribulation," he refers expressly to this, saying, "When ye shall see the abomination of desolation spoken of by Daniel the prophet," &c. [1]

[1] Dan. xi. 31; xii. 11; (compare ix. 27;) Matt. xxiv. 15; Mark xiii. 14.

That the time of trouble and tribulation prophesied of by Daniel and Christ, was really the time of the siege and destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans,— less than forty years from the utterance of the prophecy by our Lord, — appears not only from the whole tenor of His discourse, and especially from his solemn affirmation, "Verily I say to you, This generation shall not pass till all these things be fulfilled," [1] — but also from a like solemn averment made by an angel to Daniel, concerning some war-making personage or power, probably Roman, that "when he shall have accomplished to scatter the power of the holy [or "select"] people, all these things shall be finished." [2] Note. The word "holy" is here used in its primitive import, denoting set apart, or select, or chosen. "The holy people" is thus the same as Daniel's people, or God's "chosen" people, that is, the nation of the Jews." [3]

The texts in hand from Daniel and John, with a considerable portion of their contexts, seem to refer to the same events. As I interpret the texts, "many," in Daniel, is fully equal to "all," in John.

The phrase, "many of them who sleep," though usually construed as equivalent to "many of *those* who sleep," has, obviously, *not* that particular meaning. The pronoun "them" stands for "thy people," in the verse previous; and a *comma* seems to be called for between "them" and "who," — the sense evidently being, "and many of thy people, the ones who sleep in the dust of the earth, shall awake," &c.,— which is equivalent to saying that *all* shall awake who shall be at that time asleep. In like manner, it is a sheer assumption that all mankind were intended when the Saviour

[1] Matt. xxiv. 34. (Compare Mark xiii. 30.)
[2] Dan. xii. 7. [3] Isaiah xl. 8, 9; xliv. 1, 2; *et al.*

said that "all" in the graves should hear his voice. Not all the literally dead are literally buried. The word "all," in this place, embraces in its meaning only just so many as, at the time mentioned, should be "in the graves," in the sense intended; that is, as is shown by the context, just so many as should at that time be dead; but dead in a different sense from that of bodily demise.

Some of the dead, at the time of the utterance of the text in John, were hearing the voice of Christ in a spiritual sense; and all who thus heard, lived — had everlasting or spiritual life. In relation to such is the Saviour's declaration, that *they* had not — and, by implication, should not — "come into condemnation", damnation, or judgment. In relation to all others (of that nation) the opposite was true — "to the resurrection of damnation", condemnation, or judgment, they should most certainly come. Within that generation, all whom the gospel should fail of awaking to life, would be awaked by the judgments of God; — from the afflictive operation of which judgments the faithful Christians were to be exempt. Thus an angel says to Daniel, "And at that time" —, the unexampled time of trouble he had just mentioned, — "thy people shall be delivered, every one who shall be found written in the book."

It is also said in Daniel, "None of the wicked shall understand, but the wise shall understand." [1] The righteous and the wise, then, are, in this text, the same. In accordance with this, the Saviour says, "those who have done good, to the resurrection of life." That is, the righteous, or the wise, who should understand, and believe, and obey, the gospel, and so be in the possession and

[1] Dan. xii. 10.

enjoyment of everlasting, eternal, or spiritual life, should come forth out of the low, degraded, miserable condition of the nation at large; and should enjoy an immunity from the "great tribulation" which was soon to come upon the rejectors of Christ. On the other hand, he says, "those who have done evil, to the resurrection of damnation." That is, the wicked, or the unwise, who shall *not* understand, and believe, and obey, "the glorious gospel of Christ," shall come forth to judgment and condemnation — shall awake to shame and ever-[*or* age-]lasting contempt, in a series of unparalleled sufferings from famine, pestilence, and deadly warfare, — and in being dispersed for ages among the nations of the earth, their name a by-word and a term of reproach throughout the civilized world. (See Deut. xxviii. 37, 64; Jer. xxiii. 40.)

In regard to the true import of the passage from Revelation, — xx. 4–6, *et seq.*, — I beg leave to refer the reader to Whittemore's Commentary on the Revelation, *in loco*.

## CHAPTER XVI.

### THE LAST JUDGMENT.

ANOTHER doctrine very generally received in the Christian church, and which I consider very greatly erroneous, is, that the resurrection of the dead is to be attended with a train of proceedings usually denominated "the last judgment," or the "general judgment."

One chief circumstance relating to the resurrection, is commonly believed to be this, that by means of it, all our race, from Adam to the last of his posterity, are to be gathered into one assemblage, for the purpose of being individually and severally adjudged either to happiness or to misery. It is even supposed by some, that the following text of traditional Scripture, put into the mouth of the archangel, or at least made to issue from the mouth of his trumpet, belongs to the genuine written word: "Arise, ye dead! and come to judgment."

I propose to present certain Scriptural facts which evince, to my mind, that the doctrine in mention is not really a part of Christianity. Not that I, by any means, deny, or even call in question, the fact of man's accountability to God. I hold, most sincerely, that HE will "bring every work into judgment," and "render to every man according to his deeds."[1] Yet the common doc

[1] Eccl. xii. 14; Rom. ii. 6.

trine on this subject, I cannot receive. Facts go against it.

1. In the parable of the sheep and the goats, — so called, — wherein is given by far the most extended account which the Bible contains of what is commonly taken to be the last, or the general judgment, — so called, — it is not once said, nor is such a thing ever *intimated*, that the adjudication there described is to be attendant on the resurrection. On the contrary, the *time* of the judgment is set forth to be at the occurrence of quite another event, — the *coming* of the Son of man in his glory, — concerning which event he had just instructed his disciples that *it*, with certain other events, should happen "immediately after the tribulation" which he had been describing, and of which mention was made in our last chapter.

The parable above alluded to, commences thus:

"When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then," &c. Matt. xxv. 31.

Concerning this coming of our Lord, he had himself, in the same discourse, not only announced, as I have already said, that it should be in close proximity to the "tribulation" he had mentioned, but He had also expressly declared that it should happen in that "generation:"

"Immediately after [*or* immediately upon,] the tribulation of those days shall the sun be darkened, ..... and then shall appear the sign of the Son of man in heaven, and then shall all the tribes of the earth [— rightly, "of the land —] mourn, and they shall see the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory .....Verily I say unto you, This generation shall not pass till all these things [, *which is to say*, these predictions,] be fulfilled," Matt. xxiv. 29 — 35.

To the same purport are other passages:

"When they persecute you in this city, flee ye into another: for verily I say unto you, Ye shall not have gone over the cities of Israel till the Son of man be come. Matt. x. 23.

"For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father, with his angels; and then shall he reward every man according to his works. Verily I say unto you, There are some standing here which shall not taste of death till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom." Matt. xvi. 27, 28.

2. In the 15th chapter of 1st Corinthians, which chapter, as has been before observed, is a professed dissertation on the subject of the resurrection, the idea is not once even hinted at, that the rising of the dead is to be accompanied or followed by a judgment, in the commonly received sense of that expression. And such omission is the more significant from the circumstance that the apostle's range of thought in this chapter, certainly embraces the *time* when such a judgment must occur, if ever.

It should be observed here, that, over and above our Lord's introduction into this mode of being, there are mentioned in the New Testament *two* distinct *comings* of Christ, differing considerably in character, and widely distant from each other in time. The former, of a non-personal nature, was to happen at the close of the Jewish age or dispensation, about forty years from the time when He entered upon his public ministry; the latter, personal, was — and is — to transpire at the close of the Christian age, or, as Paul would express it, at "the end" of Christ's reign. In connection with the former of these comings, a judgment is usually mentioned, but never a resurrection, that is, to immortality; — in connection with the latter, the resurrection is usually mentioned, but never a judgment, nor indeed any thing equivalent to what is commonly understood by that term.

The passages in John v. and Rev. xx. which speak of two resurrections, have indeed a judg-

ment connected with them; but having seen, in the chapter next preceding this, that neither of these resurrections is a rising to immortality, we must now see, of course, that the judgment mentioned in John and described in Revelation, belongs altogether to this mortal state.[1] See the close of our next chapter.

3. In all the Scriptures, if I am not mistaken, the resurrection and the judgment are not, in even a single instance, described as accompanying events. There is one text, however, which, owing to preconceived opinions, may naturally enough be thought to teach the contrary of this:

"He who rejecteth me, and receiveth not my words, hath one that [, *or* that which] judgeth him: the word which I have spoken, the same shall judge him in the last day." John xii. 48.

By *assuming* that "the last day" is a time when all our race shall be at once immortalized, the above text seems to teach the common day-of-judgment doctrine as plainly as can be. But if by the last day, as mentioned in this text, we understand the close of the Jewish age, — at which time, as we have seen, a judgment truly did occur, — the whole aspect of the text is at once changed. And certainly, on the day of Pentecost, the Apostle Peter taught expressly that the then present time was included in "the last days," declaring, in reference to the gift of languages, "This *is* that which was spoken by the prophet Joel, And it shall come to pass *in the last days*, saith God, that I will pour out of my Spirit," &c. In an other place, the affirmation is, "God . . . . hath in these last days spoken to us by His Son."[2]

"In the last days," and "In the last day," are indeed somewhat different expressions, "days"

[1] John v. 21-30; Rev. xx. 11-15. [2] Acts ii. 16, 17; Heb. i. 1, 2.

being plural, and "day" being singular. Of course, there is a shade of difference in their import. The former comprehends a considerable space of time *near* the close of that age; the latter a brief period *at* its close. Jesus appeared near the close of the Jewish age, or in the last *days* of it, and spoke the word which *at* the close of that age, or in the last *day* of it, was to judge or condemn those who rejected him. (See Chap. xx.)

There is one passage where resurrection and judgment are actually placed together — not, however, as accompanying events, but as separate items of Christian doctrine:

> "Leaving the principles of the doctrine of Christ, let us go on to perfection; not laying again the foundation of repentance from dead works, and of faith toward God, of the doctrine of baptisms, and of laying on of hands, and of resurrection of the dead, and of eternal judgment." Heb. vi. 1, 2.

The fact that resurrection and judgment are mentioned together in the above-cited passage, no more proves that mankind are to be judged on rising, than the mention of those *other* "principles" in connection with the resurrection, proves that, on that occasion, men will repent, and believe, and be baptized.

The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews being manifestly a man of sense, the phrase "eternal judgment" is manifestly a mistranslation. No intelligent writer would put forth such an expression as his own. The word *eternal* signifies "without beginning or end;"— how, then, can it be understandingly applied to *judgment*, even though taken —, as it sometimes now is, — in but the latter half of its signification?

The *noun* from which the word here rendered "eternal" is derived, signifies, primarily, "age;" and, of course, the primary sense of the *adjective*

would naturally be "pertaining to an age," or "to the age;" in a word, *agical*, if such a word there were. And this I take to be its meaning in the text above cited. See Chapter vi.

The particular judgment which the apostle had in his mind when penning the passage in hand, I deem to be that which was to happen at the close of the Jewish age, when Jesus should come in his kingdom and glory. Concerning this coming of Christ, it is declared in this very Epistle, "Yet *a little while*, and He who shall come will come, and will not tarry." [1]

The Epistle to the Hebrews, that is, to the Jewish Christians, — so to call them, — is believed to have been written but "a little while" —, six or eight years at farthest, — before the destruction of Jerusalem. The like may be said of the Epistle of James, in which we are assured that "the coming of the Lord draweth nigh." And in view of its near approach, he presently adds, (which shows incontestibly that Christ's then impendent coming was really for judgment,) "Behold the JUDGE standeth before the door." [2]

Note. James also seems to be writing to Jewish converts; for the persons addressed by him he styles "the twelve tribes scattered abroad."

There is one passage more which, in the absence of stronger proof, is not unfrequently adduced to show that judgment is not executed at all in this world, but is all future, and is to accompany the resurrection:

"HE hath appointed a day in which He will judge the world in righteousness, by that man whom He hath ordained, whereof He hath given assurance to all men, in that He hath raised *him* from the dead." Acts xvii. 31.

We are sometimes gravely told that, in this text,

[1] Heb. x. 37. [2] James v. 7-9.

the judgment of the world is undeniably connected with the resurrection. Connected with *a* resurrection it indeed is — but how? Why, the fact that GOD raised Christ, gives assurance to all that by Him GOD will judge the world. *When* will HE do this? In that day which HE hath appointed. But does the text even intimate that the day mentioned is a mere diurnal reach of time, to occur after an unknown number of centuries, in which brief period —, when it shall arrive, — the whole work of judgment is to be accomplished? Not it, nor anything like it. And the direct contrary had been taught by Him to whom is committed the work of judgment. "Now" —, said He, (which evinces that the work was even then in progress,) — *now* "is the judgment of this world." [1]

The beloved disciple testifies that "the Father sent the Son to be the Saviour of the world." And Jesus himself says, "I came . . . . . to save the world." [2] But it is also an undeniable fact that the world is not yet saved; and hence the conclusion is quite inevitable that the salvation of the world is future. It by no means follows from this, however, that the work of salvation is not yet even begun; for, over and above the experience of every true Christian, Saint Paul has said, "Behold now is the day of salvation." [3] And Christian teachers, for at least several centuries, have each applied this text to his own times; and no one doubts, even now, that "now" is the day of salvation, the work being in progress. In like manner, God has appointed a day in which HE will judge the world by Jesus Christ; and yet it was true eighteen hundred years ago, and is still as true as ever, that "*now*" is the judgment of this world, the process being constantly going on.

[1] John xii. 31. [2] 1 John iv. 14; John xii. 47. [3] 2 Cor. vi. 2.

The whole is made up of its parts. The ap pointed judgment day includes numerous special days, hours, or seasons, of judgment. The following text testifies the presence of one such season during the *gospel* day, and seemingly soon after its commencement:

"I saw an other angel fly in the midst of heaven, having the everlasting gospel to preach to those who dwell on the earth, and to every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people, saying with a loud voice, Fear God, and give glory to him, for the *hour* of *his judgment* is *come*." Rev. xiv. 6. 7. (Compare Matt. xxiv. 14, 31.)

The close of the Jewish age or dispensation was denominated the last day or time, as we have seen; and at that period Christ was to *come*, that is, in his kingdom and glory; and his coming at that time was to be attended with a judgment; and so this last day or last time was actually a *day* of judgment to the Jews as a nation. And thus in other instances. Any day or time in which judgment is rendered, is clearly a day or time of judgment to the party judged, whether such party is a nation, a city, or an individual. And further, all such days, hours, or times, of special judgment, are included, of course, in that comprehensive day which God has appointed, namely, the entire term of Christ's reign.

The writer sincerly hopes that these general remarks may prove somewhat useful, not only in illustration of the Scriptures already cited, but as leading to a correct understanding of those texts —, to be considered in our next chapter,— in which occurs the expression, "the day of judgment." It is believed by him, that those texts refer to the punishment of the Jews as a nation, or else to some other judgment special to the party judged.

## CHAPTER XVII.

### THE LAST JUDGMENT — CONCLUDED.

THE phrase, "the day of judgment," occurs in the New Testament eight times. In the Septuagint, or Greek translation of the Old Testament, the expression for day of judgment occurs once; though in the Common Version, the original of that place is rendered "the day of vengeance."[1] In certain passages in the New Testament, parallel to those in which the expression day of judgment is found, the phrases "the judgment" and "that day" occur, evidently in the same sense as day of judgment, whatever that sense may be. It is proper to be known also, that, except in one instance, to be noticed presently, the Greek rendered "the day of judgment," is not literally "the," but "*a* day of judgment." The word for "the" is wanting also in the Greek of a phrase in Jude rendered "the judgment of the great day."

Those texts in the New Testament containing the expression "the day of judgment" are the following:

I. John, in his First Epistle, speaks of himself and his brethren as having "boldness in the day of judgment," which day he evidently viewed to be near. Thus he says:

"Little children, *it is the last time:* and as ye have heard that antichrist shall come, even now are their many antichrists;

[1] Prov. vi. 34.

whereby we *know* that it is the last time. They went out from *us*, but they were not *of* us." 1 John ii. 18, 19.

"And now little children, abide in Him; that when he shall appear, [literally, "shall be manifested,"] we may have confidence, and not be ashamed before Him at His coming." Chap. ii. 28.

"Herein is our love made perfect, that we may have boldness *in the day of judgment*; because as He is, so are we in this world." Chap. iv. 17.

The above last-cited text is the only one in which the original has the *article* —, so called, — prefixed to day of judgment. In it, the beloved disciple seems certainly to be speaking of THE day or time of judgment then impending, or, as it were, on the very *eve* of occurring, in reference to the unbelieving Jews and apostate Jewish converts, — at which crisis * Christ was to *come*, or be manifested in power and glory, and the judgments of God be executed upon the Jews as a nation.

N. B. It is thought that this Epistle was written even later than the Epistle to the Hebrews; and of course, only a *very* "little while"—, some think only a year or two, — before the fall of Jerusalem.

II. In one place, the Saviour seems to be laying down a general proposition in regard to human accountability; (as indeed he may be;) yet it is obvious that His affirmation in the text alluded to and to be presently quoted, was called forth by the *blasphemous* language of the Scribes and Pharisees. Note. These had just been attributing his miracles to the agency of Beelzebub, the supposed Prince of demons. Hence He says to them:

* "Crisis." In the phrase "day of judgment," the Greek for judgment is the word from which comes the Latin and English word "crisis." (See CRISIS in Webster's Dictionary.) The Greek word has various significations in the New Testament,—among which are crisis and judgment; — the latter in the sense of a judicial verdict, whether of acquittal, or of condemnation; also, in the sense of punishment, or the due execution of a condemnatory verdict or sentence. (See Chap. 6.)

"O generation of vipers, how can ye, being evil, speak good things? . . . . . But I say to you, That every idle word which men shall speak, they shall give account thereof *in the* [, rightly "*in a*"] *day of judgment.*" Matt. xii. 34–36.

Christ's doctrine in this text seems to be, that God, in His government of the world, holds men accountable not only for actions, but also for words, yea, even for verbal trifling; — how much more, then, for downright and impudent blasphemy!

III. The apostle Peter speaks of the or a day of judgment in two texts; and it is a noteworthy fact, — though probably seldom noted, — that day of judgment, in *his* use of the expression, is equivalent to day of punishment or retribution. Thus, in the first text, he says:

"The Lord knoweth how to deliver the godly out of temptations, [rather, "out of trial,"] and to reserve the unjust *to the day of judgment* to be punished." Rightly, "to *a* day" &c. 2 Pet. 11. 9.

Observe, here, that Peter does not say, to a day of judgment to be judged, condemned, or sentenced; but, "to a day of judgment to be *punished.*" And by examining the context, it will be seen that the text is but the conclusion of a paragraph in which are given several examples of punishment and deliverance. It is clear, then, that the punishing, and the delivering, taught in the text, are to be understood in the light of those examples; and his preceding remarks seem clearly to show that the approaching national punishment of the Jews and false Christians, and the deliverance therefrom of all true Christians, is really the subject in hand. He reminds the brethren that God burned Sodom, and delivered Lot; that He drowned the old world, and saved Noah, &c.; and from these examples he draws the very

natural conclusion, that "The Lord knoweth," &c., as in the text. And mentioning certain "false teachers" and their followers, he declares of them, that their "judgment now of a long time lingereth not, and their damnation slumbereth not,"[1] — forms of expression which seem very far from indicating that the time of the judgment of those persons has not yet arrived.

In the second text where Peter speaks of a "day of judgment," he subjoins —, without the intervention of even a *comma*, — "and perdition of ungodly men",[2] — thus plainly teaching that the day mentioned was as much a day of perdition or destruction as it was of judgment.

In the highly figurative style of the ancient prophets, the apostle sets forth that "the world" in the time of the deluge, "being overflowed with water, *perished*"; that "the heavens and the earth" existing in his day were "reserved to fire against a day of judgment and perdition;" and that the heavens would be "dissolved," and the earth be "burned up." And whatever the exact nature of the catastrophe was which he had in his mind, he evidently viewed it to be close at hand; for he tells of "looking for and hasting to the coming of the day of God, wherein" the events mentioned were to occur.

IV. In reference to the fate of certain *cities* in a day of judgment, Jesus speaks in the following passages thus:

Matt. x. 5–23. "These twelve [, his apostles,] Jesus sent forth, and commanded them, saying, Go . . . . . to the lost sheep of the house of Israel. And as ye go, preach . . . . . And whosoever shall not receive you, nor hear your words, when ye depart out of that house or city, shake off the dust of your feet. Verily I say unto you, It shall be more tolerable for

[1] Pet. ii. 1–3. [2] 2 Pet. iii. 7.

the land of Sodom and Gomorrah *in the* [rightly, "*in a*] *day of judgment*, than for that city.

(Mark xi. 20–24. The same, in brief, is found here as in the above; but that part of the passage containing the phrase "the day of judgment" is reckoned an interpolation.)

Matt. xi. 20–24. "Then began He to upbraid the cities wherein most of his mighty works were done, because they repented not: Woe to thee, Chorazin! Woe to thee, Bethsaida! for if the mighty works which were done in you, had been done in Tyre and Sidon, they would have repented long ago in sackcloth and ashes. But I say to you, It shall be more tolerable for Tyre and Sidon *at the* [, rightly, "*in a*,"] *day of judgment*, than for you. And thou, Capernaum, which art exalted [to heaven, shalt be brought down to hell: [that is, to a condition as *low*, comparatively, as thy present condition is high :] for if the mighty works which have been done in thee, had been done in Sodom, it would have remained until this day. But I say to you, That it shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom *in the* [rightly, "*in a*"] *day of judgment* than for thee."

Although no allusion is made to the resurrection in any Scripture text which mentions a day of judgment, it must be confessed that, at first view, the above texts seem to *imply* that the day of the judgment of some persons, is, or at least was, *after their deaths*, — and, in the case of certain persons, a great while after. Thus, to present the case in the aspect most favorable to such a conclusion, the inhabitants of Sodom and Gomorrah had long ceased to exist in this world; and yet the Saviour, speaking of those cities in connection with a judgment, indisputably made use of the future tense; affirming, in substance, "It shall be more tolerable for Sodom and Gomorrah in a day of judgment, than for those cities of Judea who shall refuse to receive my disciples, and to listen to their words." The like is declared of Capernaum, and of other cities, because they repented not, after having witnessed His mighty works. But now, several circumstances demand attention:

1. The cities which the Saviour "upbraids," he

seems to address in their *corporate* capacity, as individual cities, saying, "*Thou*, Capernaum," "Woe to *thee*, Chorazin!" &c. This form of address most naturally conveys the idea that temporal destruction was the kind of punishment He viewed as awaiting each of them.

2. In speaking of the future fate of the Jewish cities adverted to, He compares it with the fate — not of the *people*, but — of the *land* of Sodom and Gomorrah. This form of expression is unmistakably indicative of temporal destruction.

3. He avers of Sodom, that it would have remained until that time, had the mighty works been done in it which had lately been done in Capernaum. This is an indisputable allusion to the temporal fate of the city of Sodom; — but why this, unless the temporal fate of Capernaum was in His mind?

4. In a passage from Luke, parallel to the two from Matthew, instead of "day of judgment," the expressions "that day" and "the judgment" occur: "It shall be more tolerable *in that day* for Sodom, than for that city." "Woe to thee, Chorazin! Woe to thee, Bethsaida! . . . . . it shall be more tolerable for Tyre and Sidon *at* [or "*in*"] *the judgment*, than for you."

5. The only argument of any force which the texts in hand furnish in favor of the common doctrine, arises from the presence of the future tense in the Saviour's declaration, "It shall be more tolerable" &c. Were it not for this, there could be no doubt that the comparison, as to tolerableness, is between the temporal fate of the Jewish cities named or adverted to, and the temporal fate of the other cities named.

6. Under the pressure of the above-named circumstances, some commentators, believers in the

common doctrine as to a judgment, have been constrained to admit, despite their prejudices, that the future judgment of *the people* of Sodom and the other cities mentioned, *is not shown* by the use of the future tense in the texts under examination. *

The author of this work is decidedly of the opinion that the affirmation of the Saviour, in those texts, "It shall be more tolerable," &c., is an *elliptical* form of speech; and that in order to express the true sense, unambiguously, in any language (excepting possibly the Jewish vernacular,) the ellipsis must be filled by some phrase in the past tense, so that the whole shall naturally convey the idea that the recorded destruction of Sodom, &c., when compared with what was to befall the Jewish cities referred to, will plainly appear the "more tolerable" of the two. As if our Lord had actually said, "It shall be — *seen to have been* — more tolerable for the land of Sodom and Gomorrah, in a day of judgment, [*or* punishment,] than for" the Jewish cities named and adverted to. And so of the others.

There is one text which, incidentally, does actually teach a judgment of some sort "*after*" a death in some sense; but it is certain that the subject to which it relates is entirely *foreign* to the doctrine under consideration. As commonly brought forward in proof of that doctrine, only a part of the sentence is quoted, and that not in full; and as to the *context*, no notice whatever is taken of it:

* See Paige's "Selections from Eminent Commentators," Sections 1, 16, 20, where quotations are given from Hammond, Pearce, Wakefield, Adam Clarke, and others. It is manifest, however, that though some rays of truth on this subject had penetrated the minds of those "eminent" men, their ideas were yet not a little confused.

"And as it is appointed to men once to die, but after this the judgment: so Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many, and to those who look for him shall He appear the second time without sin [, or "without a sin-*offering*",] to salvation." Heb. ix. 27, 28. (Literally, "appointed to the men"; "after this a judgment"; "the sins of the many"; "appear a second time.")

*As* is the one half of this sentence, *so* most certainly must be the other half, the latter being the counterpart of the former, which fact is evinced by the presence of the corresponding comparative conjunctions, "as — so." Without any particular knowledge of the context, we might be perfectly sure, that *as* Christ's being "once offered to bear the sins of the many" was a sort of *sacrificial* death, — *so* the dying of "the men once", with which the death of Christ is compared, must be of a sacrifical character also. We might be certain, too, that *as* Christ's "second" or after appearing was to be "to salvation", — *so* the "judgment" that was to follow the mens' dying must be a verdict in *favor* of those interested. And we might know, further, that *as* Christ's being "once offered" was by Divine appointment, — *so* the Power that "appointed" the men to die once must be no other than God. But in order to determine, with the same certainty, who were intended by "the men"; in what sense they were "to die"; what is meant by their being appointed to die "once"; how "a judgment" or favorable verdict would come "after this;" who were particularly interested in that verdict, and so correspond to "the many" for whom Christ was offered; and so of the rest; — we doubtless should be obliged to consult *the context;* which, happily, when taken along with what we know of the Levitical regulations, renders the reference of the text perfectly clear.

The context, in the instance just mentioned, comprises several chapters. From an attentive perusal of these, may be gathered the following particulars :

1. "*The men*" mentioned in the text are the Jewish high-priests, — compared and contrasted with "The Apostle and High-priest of our profession, Christ Jesus." [1]

2. They are spoken of in the plural, as "*men*," because, as the apostle here says, "they truly were many priests," for the reason that, being mortal, one died, and an other succeeded him, — while Christ, having "an endless life," can not vacate the office by death, and so has a priestship which is "unchangeable," or passes not to a successor, He being the sole and perpetual High-Priest of the Christian age. [2]

3. Those men being appointed "*to die*", means being appointed to do so *by proxy*, in their sacrifices, or, as the apostle expresses it, to enter "into the Holy-Place every year *with blood of others*," that is, of the animals sacrificed, — while Christ, "by His *own* blood", or, as is also said, "by the sacrifice of *Himself*," "entered in once into The Holy-Place", not, however, into one "made with hands," "but into *heaven* itself." [3]

4. By their being appointed to die "*once*," is meant the same as in the preceding and succeeding expressions, "once every year," "year by year," &c., that is, on the day of atonement, — as set against Christ's being offered "once," which, in like manner, is explained to mean *not* "often, as the high-priest entereth into the holy-place every year," but "once for all," which is to say, once and no more. [4]

[1] Heb. vii. 28; iii. 1.
[2] Heb. vii. 16, 23, 24.
[3] Heb. ix. 11, 12, 24, 25, 26.
[4] Heb. ix. 7, 25; x. 1, 10.

5. The "judgment" or verdict following the sacrificial death of each high-priest, was the assurance given to "the people" of Israel, by the reappearance of such high-priest, or his safe return out from the Holy of Holies, that "the errors of the people," for the year then ended, were forgiven, — as compared with certain facts relating to Christ, who is (or was) to "appear a second time" &c. [1]

In a certain sense, judgment after the death of the body may be regarded as a Scripture doctrine. To judge sometimes signifies to rule. The first rulers of Israel were called judges. Jesus Christ rules, that is, exercises dominion over, both dead and living; or, as the Common Version has it, He is "*Lord* both of the dead and living." [2]

In Rev. 20th, a *judgment* of "the dead" is described, as was remarked in our last chapter; yet, from the metaphorical character of the language employed, it is evident that the subjects of that judgment were dead in some other than a physical sense. Thus it is said:

"And I saw a great white throne, and Him who sat on it, from whose face the earth and the heaven fled away; and there was found no place for them.....And the sea gave up the dead which were in it; and death and hell delivered up the dead which were in them; and they were judged," &c. Rev. xx. 11–13.

The *sea* might give up dead bodies, that is, the bodies of those recently drowned therein, also, those bodies recently committed thereto; but surely, it is *persons*, not their cast-off bodies, who are proper subjects of judgment. We are not told that the *earth* yielded up her dead; which, *perhaps*, may be accounted for by supposing that this "terrestrial ball" had "fled away" to "no place"

[1] Heb. ix. 7; Ex. xxx. 10; Lev. xvi. 2–34. [2] Rom. xiv. 9.

before the proceedings commenced. *Death* is obviously not a place or space at all, nor has it, *literally*, any capaciousness whatever; yet the dead which were in it were duly delivered up. *Hell*, also, delivered up its dead; but *heaven*, or "the heaven," surrendered none of its inhabitants, whether it had "fled away" previously, or had not. The whole scene is thus manifestly figurative. See Whittemore on the Revelation.

For the proper import of the word rendered "hell" in the above passage, see Chapter iii. of this work.

## CHAPTER XVIII.

### ENDLESS PUNISHMENT.

It has been believed by a very great majority of the Christian church for more than a thousand years, that, after the resurrection, if not before it, many, very many, of mankind are each to be subjected to an amount and degree of penal suffering, compared with which the greatest and most severe tortures ever inflicted by the cruelest of human monsters, are but as a drop to the ocean, or as the tiniest spark to Nebuchadnezzar's furnace in fullest blast.

It is believed also, that these unparalleled and seemingly insupportable torments are to be ever and ever increasing — that through long, long days, and weeks, and months, and years, of direful agony, the tardy moments, as they successively arrive, will each be fraught with fresh and fiercer pains.

It is further believed —, and this is the chief idea directly presented by this doctrine, — that these torments of the wicked, beyond the resurrection, are to be positively *endless* with each individual; — not merely that such torments are to be inflicted without intermission, and endured without alleviation, through accumulated and accumulating years, and centuries, and ages, and ages-of-ages, and these last multiplied *ad indefinitum*; — but

that the torments of the wicked are absolutely to continue *ad æternum*, or to duration without end.

It is also very generally held in regard to those torments, that *the resurrection* will greatly enhance them; and it is taught by some that the very *existence* of such torments depends upon the resurrection; they holding that without it there is neither happiness nor misery. The wicked are to be raised that they may be judged; and the judgment eventuates in their being sentenced to endless suffering. It is thus entirely apparent that the doctrine claims an intimate relation to our general subject, and is therefore entitled to a share of our attention in the present work.

The doctrine of endless punishment is in a manner venerable on account of its age; and it has long been highly popular from the great number of its advocates and votaries; yet it is objected to as being unreasonable, unphilosophical, and especially unscriptural. Thus,

I. The doctrine of endless punishment ascribes to the "living" or really existing God, — possessing the attributes of power, wisdom, and goodness, — a proceeding, toward some of His creatures, exactly in accordance with the character of an imaginary god, possessing the attributes of power, wisdom, and badness.

The above may be a startling proposition, to some; yet its truth can be easily shown:

The causing of an individual to be as miserable as is possible in the nature of things, and the protracting of that misery to the longest possible extent, (endless punishment as commonly taught,) is actually doing to that individual *the very worst* that could be done by an infinitely evil-disposed Being, with ability and contrivance equal to his malevolence. Yet, according to the doctrine under

examination, "the LORD God, merciful," who is declaredly "good to all," will, in millions of instances, do just those things. [1]

The argument from the foregoing premises is, that it is absurd to suppose that a *good* being, other things being equal, will do just what a BAD being naturally would. "A good tree"—, says the Saviour,—can not bring forth evil fruit." [2] The conclusion hence is, that the infliction of an endless punishment is inconsistent with the character of God; and that, therefore, the doctrine is untrue.

It has indeed been claimed that this kind of argumentation is fallacious, for that if it had been employed in the beginning, it would have proved just as clearly the erroneous proposition, that God being good, misery could never be experienced under His government. No such thing, however, could have been thus proved,—it being a fact that the argument from God's goodness has reference only to *final results.*

It is true, without doubt, as the Saviour sets forth, that a good tree can not yield evil fruit; and it is true, in like manner, as he also sets forth, that "the tree is known by its fruit." [3] But in the use and application of these proverbial sayings, ☞ it is always supposed that the fruit of the tree is *ripe.*

Take, for example, the *plum.* Suppose that a specimen of this fruit, full-grown, though altogether *unripe,* is eaten by a person wholly ignorant of a future ripening. Ill-tasted as he finds it, he can not do otherwise than consider the tree it grew on to be, as a fruit-tree, bad. And if assured of the

[1 Ex. xxxiv. 6; Ps. cxlv. 9. 2 Matt. vii. 18.
3 Matt. xii. 33

tree's goodness, he will, of course, conclude that, in at least one instance, the proverbs adverted to have proved false. Yet every one else would know his conclusion to be erroneous, knowing that, in a few days, the fruit being *ripe*, would possess altogether different qualities; and thus the truth of those proverbial sayings be clearly and abundantly manifested.

So in respect to the existence of suffering under the government of an all-benevolent God. Suffering, in general, may be regarded as punishment, chastisement, or chastening, inflicted in consequence of transgression of some law of God, spiritual, moral, mental, or physical. Of such chastisement the apostle assures us "all are partakers." And though it is grievously true, as the apostle reminds his brethren, that "no chastening for the present seemeth to be joyous, but grievous," an other thing is joyfully true, as the apostle immediately adds, that "afterward it yieldeth the peaceable fruit of righteousness to those who are exercised thereby." [1]

It evidently argues nothing against the Divine goodness, that suffering, as a punishment for transgression, prevails for a limited term of time. But it being a fact that a punishment for an unlimited or endless term of time, could do no possible good; and therefore that it could be no less than wholly evil; and consequently that it would be exactly, perfectly, and in all respects consistent with the character of an all-evil god; — it can not but be also a fact that such a punishment would be totally *in*consistent with the character of HIM who is emphatically "good to all," and "with whom is no variableness, neither shadow of turning." [2]

[1] Heb. xii. 5-11. [2] James i. 17.

Observe, also, that the "afterward" mentioned by the apostle, utterly precludes the idea of punishment being endless.

Those who are exercised by God's chastisements or chastenings, can never taste the peaceable fruit of righteousness until they themselves become righteous; and when all become righteous, punishment must most certainly cease, its object having been attained. See the statement of the apostle, in the passage here alluded to, that God chastens us "for our profit, that we might be partakers of His holiness."[1]

II. If any are to be endlessly punished, such punishment is of course demanded by the justice of God. But the time can never come when an endless punishment shall have been suffered; hence if justice really demands such a punishment, her demands must, of necessity, remain eternally unsatisfied. And it seems altogether unphilosophical to suppose that the justice of a God of wisdom would really demand what even Omnipotence itself could never cause to be paid.

III. It is declared in the Scriptures, that "Charity . . . . . rejoiceth in the truth."[2] That is to say, Those persons rejoice in the truth who are *influenced* by the virtue named. Yet no one under the influence of charity can possibly rejoice in the doctrine of endless punishment. The proof of this shall appear presently.

By "the truth," here, as in several other texts, is likely meant — not all that is true, but — that particular *system* of religious truth revealed through Jesus Christ. "To this end was I born," said the Saviour, "and for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness to the truth."[3]

[1] Heb. xii. 10. [2] 1 Cor. xiii. 6.
[3] John xviii. 37. Compare viii. 32.

Charity, in the Scriptures, is the same as love. Where the beloved disciple tells of "the love of God," and that "love is of God," and that "God is love," the word rendered "love" is the same as is rendered "charity" in all places where the word charity occurs in the Common Version. [1]

The apostle also informs us that that love or charity which rejoices in the truth, "seeketh not her own," which is equivalent to saying that charity is unselfish. It is evident, then, that the virtue he is describing is a disposition to seek the good of others — in a word, is what we now more usually call *benevolence*. The doctrine of the text then is, that a truly benevolent person —, one who is like Christ, — rejoices in the truth *revealed* by Christ. The same fact is recognized in other texts, as for example, "Now the God of hope fill you with all joy and peace in believing." [2]

Some very benevolent persons have *believed* it to be a truth that endless punishment was to be the doom of some other persons toward whom they were exercised by the most benevolent feelings. But as to whether they rejoiced or not in thus believing, we need not be told. We understand that matter in advance. I claim, then, that the doctrine of endless punishment belongs not to that system of truth revealed through Jesus Christ, for the reason that that charity which rejoices spontaneously in the truth, can not rejoice in that doctrine by any means whatever.

IV. Not only is it an obvious fact that benevolence or charity can not rejoice in the doctrine of endless punishment, but an other and equally obvious fact, is, that the contemplation of the final result presented by this doctrine, is directly and

[1] 1 John iv. 7–11. [2] 1 Cor. xiii. 5; Rom. xv. 13.

eminently calculated to affect the minds of benevolent persons in an exceedingly unpleasant and even painful manner. While the selfish, the hard-hearted, the cruel, and those also whose mouths are "full of cursing and bitterness," are very little, if any affected by it, — the gentle, the generous, the sympathizing, the loving, the Christ-like, are troubled, and saddened, and grieved, and made miserable, — are sometimes driven to insanity, and even to suicide, — simply by a strong and vivid belief in the catastrophe constituting this doctrine's essentiality. As, therefore, the effects produced by the belief of this doctrine are of a character directly the opposite of those which the Scriptures ascribe to a belief of the truth, the inference unavoidably is, that this doctrine and the truth are entirely two things.

V. According to the Scriptures, as I shall presently show, charity or benevolence will be known and exercised in the hereafter state, it being intimately connected with the *perfection* of that state:

"Charity never faileth; but whether there be prophecies, they shall fail; whether there be tongues, they shall cease; whether there be knowledge, it shall vanish away. For we know in part, and we prophesy in part. But when that which is perfect is come, then that which is in part shall be done away .... And now abideth faith, hope, charity, these three; but the greatest of these is charity." 1 Cor. xiii. 8–13.

"Put on charity, which is the bond of perfectness." Coll. iii. 14.

From the above quotations, it is plain that, according to the Scriptures, charity or benevolence *does not cease* with the present life, but survives, as a connecting, uniting, *binding* force, in a much more perfect mode of existence. This being so, the endless misery of any human being is superlatively improbable; since, from the exercise of sympathy, such misery would most certainly be

*shared,* and that endlessly, by those who manifestly do not *deserve* to be rendered thus miserable.

The Scriptures, in special and in general terms, exhort to the exercise of sympathy with our fellows; as, "Remember those who are in bonds, . . . and those who suffer adversity;" "Rejoice with those who rejoice, and weep with those who weep."[1] Such sympathy is demanded by the law of love, which law, being based in the nature of God, is authoritative in all worlds. If, therefore, it is the duty of a Christian to sympathize with human suffering while in this earthly state, it must be equally his duty to do so after having passed into the celestial state.

But law or no law, duty or not a duty, the truly benevolent, whether they express their feelings or not, always *do* sympathize with others in their joys and their sorrows, as did Jesus, the dear Son of God. It is natural for such to do so, even as it was for Him. Perhaps they could not easily refrain from it, if they would; and we may be quite certain that they *would* not, if they could ever so easily.

There is a feeling extant in our world, a good expression of which is, "Let *me* be saved — I ask no more." The existence of this feeling is perhaps a principal reason why the endless punishment of *all* has seldom or never been in a direct manner taught. Give it its due. The after-death state, as all agree, is to be a state of happiness to some. But if those "some" are governed by the spirit of Christ, and *not* by unmixed, unmitigated selfishness, they cannot possibly be *very* happy, if also they see it to be a fact that others are perfectly and irremediably miserable. Nor this alone. If such misery is actually seen to be endless, the

[1] Hebrew xiii. 3; Rom. xii. 15.

perception of this fact can not but induce in the happy a degree of positive misery. And the greater and more abundant their benevolence, the greater and more abundant their misery; and this state of things must continue, too, as long as that continues which calls forth their sympathies. If, then, some are to be endlessly miserable, *all* will be so. The dividing of the child would have been fatal to the *true* mother's half, as well as to the other.

It is therefore argued, here, that the endless punishment of any of mankind is improbable to the last degree, seeing that it would involve in a like calamity all who possess the spirit of Christ. If the punishment, however severe, were seen to be terminable in good, the case would be radically different.

## CHAPTER XIX.

### ENDLESS PUNISHMENT — CONCLUDED.

VI. There are a considerable number of Scripture texts in which the doctrine of endless punishment seems expressly negatived; as in the following:

"The Lord will not cast off forever: But though He cause grief, yet will he have compassion, according to the multitude of his mercies. For he doth not afflict willingly, nor grieve the children of men." Lam. iii. 31-33.

In this passage, we are first instructed as to what the Lord will *not* do — he will not cast off for *ever*. In the second place, we learn what He *will* do — he will exercise *compassion* to an extent commensurate with his many mercies. Thirdly, we are told, in express terms, *why* He will do the latter and will not do the former — he does not afflict *willingly*, that is, from taking pleasure in it; nor does he grieve mankind for the mere purpose of grieving them. And observe. It is no select class or classes of human beings concerning whom the above denials and affirmations are made. The prophet expressly mentions "the children of men," that is, the race in general. Observe also, that he is not treating of *national* judgments, but of God's dealings with mankind in an individual capacity. See the context: — "It is good for *a man* that he

bear the yoke in his youth. He sitteth alone, and keepeth silence, because he had borne it," &c.

The advocates of the doctrine in question contend that, in the Bible, the expression "for ever," when applied to punishment, imports a strictly endless duration. Now if it has this sense here, then are we certified, by Divine authority, that no one will be cast off for an endless duration; — hence the doctrine of endless punishment is not from God.

It is clearly a fact, however, that, in some Scripture texts, the word rendered "ever" signifies an age or indefinite period; a long, or seemingly long space of time. (See Chap. vi. of this work.) Yet if it has this sense in the passage before us, the doctrine in question is none the less negatived; — it is, in fact, negatived all the more strongly; — since if the compassions and mercies of God will not admit of His casting off any one for even an age, most certainly he will not cast off for an endless duration.

A somewhat similar passage occurs in the Book of Psalms. The writer tells of having been greatly "troubled" upon a certain subject — so troubled that (, to use his own expressions,) his eyes were held waking, his spirit was overwhelmed, and he could not even speak. And what so troubled him? Answer, he had been revolving in his own mind —, so it appears, — the following preëminently important moral questions:

"*Will the Lord cast off for ever?* and will He be favorable no more?

Is his mercy clean gone for ever? doth his promise fail for evermore?

Hath God forgotten to be gracious? hath He in anger shut up his tender mercies? Psalms lxxvii. 7-9.

No wonder the Psalmist was troubled when *such* questions haunted his mind; that is, provided he had an idea that their true answer *could* be an affirmative; and especially so, if by "for ever" he understood an endless duration. In these times, it is no unheard-of thing for persons to become *insane* over this subject.

But what conclusion did Asaph come to at last? He immediately adds, (and let all ponder these instructive words,) "And I said, *This is my infirmity.*" Yea, verily, it *was* an infirmity —, a pitiable weakness, — to even suppose, *apprehensively*, that any person could be morally cast off for ever, in even an indefinite sense; since, according to the writer's own showing, in order for God to thus cast off, during even an indefinite period, not only must His ever-enduring *mercy* be "clean gone for ever," but He must also let his promise "fail for ever-[and] more," which failure would suppose, at the least, an everlasting violation of good faith!

In an other passage, "the High and Lofty One who inhabited eternity," declares through the prophet thus:

"I will not contend for ever, neither will I be always wroth: for the spirit should fail before me, and the souls which I have made." Isa. lvii. 15.

In the Scriptures, by a figure of speech, punishment is often represented as resulting from Divine wrath, anger, indignation, or vengeance, called forth by human wickedness. Of this, the text just cited is an example, as is also the verse following it: "For the iniquity of his covetousness was I wroth and smote him," &c. Indeed, in some instances, wrath, or the like, appears to be used metonymically for punishment or retribution; as where an apostle mentions *treasuring up* "wrath against the day of wrath;" (rightly, "a day;)

also, where he assures us that "the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men," &c.[1]

Keeping in mind the above facts, one can hardly avoid seeing that the solemn declaration of the eternal God, "I will not contend for ever, neither will I be always wroth," is fully equivalent to "I will not punish any one for a long indefinite time." And how cogent also, yet easy of intellection, is the reason assigned! — "for the spirits or souls which I have made would fail before me." Can as forcible and plain a reason be given on the opposite side of the question?

Of similar import to the foregoing, are the following and several other passages:

"I am merciful, saith the Lord, and I well not keep anger for ever." Jer. iii. 12.

"He retaineth not his anger for ever, because He delighteth in mercy." Micah vii. 18.

In all texts of this class, it is manifest that the anger mentioned has no ill-will in it, each text breathing forth a spirit of pity and loving-kindness quite inconsistent with the exercise of literal anger.

There are a few texts in which *ever*, or a kindred term, is applied to punishment affirmatively. Thus David, addressing his son Solomon upon the subject of adherence to God by the continued observance of His laws, says,

"If thou forsake him, He will cast thee off for ever." 1 Chron. xxviii. 9.

In regard to the above text, one very important circumstance seems well-nigh always overlooked: David was declaring the grounds of Solomon's prosperity *as a king of Israel*, including the much

[1] Romans ii. 5; i. 18.

desired item that all the succeeding kings of Israel should be of his line. The casting off of which he speaks is therefore of a *political* character — *religio*-political, of course, yet truly political. Thus David had just been telling the people that God had promised concerning Solomon,

"I will establish his *kingdom* for ever, if he be constant to do my commandments and my judgment as at this day." Verse 7.

And in the same style of exhortation which he uses toward his son, he says to the people,

"Now therefore....keep and seek for all the commandments of the Lord your God; that ye may possess this good land, and leave it for an *inheritance* for your children after you *for ever*." Verse 8.

It being clearly a fact, then, that the topic of discourse, in relation to Solomon, was, that his kingly prosperity, especially as to being the honored progenitor of a long line of kings, depended upon his continued allegiance to Jehovah, in the punctual observance of the Mosaic code, how natural it seems for David to have said to Solomon, "If thou forsake Him," — leave off obeying His commandments, — "he will cast thee off for ever," — that is, as to prosperity in thy kingdom! Such a casting off, though it were final, or even endless, has no relation to the *common* doctrine of endless punishment.

Jesus Christ declares expressly, concerning some,

"And these shall go away into everlasting punishment." Matt. xxv. 46.

In regard to the punishment *here* mentioned, I take it upon me to affirm — what I will presently prove — that it was of a *national* character, and

hence that this oft quoted text affords not the least support to the doctrine under examination. For, unless annihilation is really an endless infliction, no punishment of a nation can be endless; for the plain reason that no nation is to have an endless existence. A national punishment may, however, be age-lasting, and yet it be entirely true, in the sense intended in Scripture, that God will *not* cast off for an age; that is, He will not cast off any *individual* for so long a time.

The text in which the phrase "everlasting punishment" occurs, is a part of the concluding verse of one of our Lord's parables, usually known as the parable of the sheep and the goats. (Properly, the rewards and punishments of the nations.) In this parable or allegory, is *supposed* to be described the yet future assembling of all mankind, and the separate adjudgment of each individual to endless happiness or to endless misery. Yet no such account, nor any thing very nearly resembling it, is actually contained therein, the accredited perceptions of thousands to the contrary notwithstanding.

Near the commencement of the description, we read as follows:

"Before Him shall be gathered all nations; and he shall separate them one from an other." Matt. xxv. 32.

It is grammatically indisputable, that the pronoun "them," in the above-quoted text, is exactly equivalent to the expression "the nations." The text does not affirm that Christ will separate each nation into the individuals composing it; much less, that He will separate the individuals of each nation one from an other; but simply, that He will separate *the nations* one from an other, they being parabolically represented as all gathered into one

assemblage. The separation, then, being clearly a *national* one, it must be also clear, that the parties were to be dealt with in a national capacity.

The limits of this work will not admit an extended exposition of this parable. I offer a brief synopsis of the principal points of such an exposition :

1. The *subject* of the parable of the sheep and the goats so styled, is the calling of the Gentiles, and the casting off the Jews.

2. The *time* of the judgment is a certain space of time ending with the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans.

3. Those on the *right* hand of the King, are the Gentiles ; those on the *left*, the Jews.

4. The King's " brethren," (constituting a third party which is usually overlooked,) are the early Christians.

5. Acts of hospitality and kindness being *done*, or *not* done, to Christ's brethren, and accounted by Him as having been done or not done to *Himself*, is a symbolization of the fact that, in general, the Gentiles received the gospel, and treated the Christians kindly, — while the conduct of the Jews, as a nation, was directly the reverse of this.

6. There being at that time no Christian nations, all nations being either Jews or Gentiles, the phrase " all nations " did not include the Christians. To these, the glorified Saviour distinctly promised that they should be seated with Him in his *throne*, and have and exercise " power over the nations : "

" To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with Me in my throne, even as I also overcame, and am set down with my Father in His throne." Rev. iii. 21.

" And he that overcometh, and keepeth my works to the end, to him will I give power over the nations : and he shall rule them ..... even as I received of my Father." Rev. ii. 26, 27.

7. The *kingdom* which those on the right hand were to be called to inherit, is Christianity, or the gospel, — the same that Jesus told the Jews should be taken from them, and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof. Matt. xxi. 43.

8. The everlasting *fire* into which those on the left were to be driven, is the unparalleled "tribulation" endured by the Jews in the siege and destruction of their metropolis. (The terms of the figure allude to the constant fire kept going in the valley of Hinnom, which fire was first kindled in sacrifices to the idol Moloch or Baal. See Jer. vii. 31, and other places.)

9. The eternal or everlasting *life* which the righteous were to go into, is that spiritual life enjoyed by believing the gospel. (See Chaps. vi., xv. of this work.)

10. The everlasting *punishment* which the others were to go away into, is the Jews' dispersion, their banishment from Judea, their nation sufferings, their spiritual blindness, &c. (See Chaps. ix., xv. of this work.)

The punishment of the Jews having now continued nearly 1800 years, and we know not how much longer it may continue, was quite as properly called "everlasting" as had been the Levitical priesthood, the possession of the land of Canaan by the Jews, &c. (See Chap. vi. of this work.)

VII. The doctrine of endless punishment is wholly at variance with the Scripture doctrine touching the final result of Christ's government, particularly as set forth in the two certain passages to be presently quoted from the apostolical writings.

The apostle is illustrating his subject by the language of the following text from the Psalmist:

"Thou hast put all things under his feet." Ps. viii. 6.

Though with a variation from our version of the Old Testament equivalent to a couple of supplied words; and that in the other passage, the text in mention is merely *alluded* to. His quotation, his allusion, and his comments, — the whole comprising the two passages, from two separate Epistles, — are as follows:

"'*Thou hast put all things* in subjection *under his feet.*' For in that He put all in subjection under him, He left nothing that is not put under him. But now we see not yet all things put under him. But we see Jesus who was made a little lower than the angels, for the suffering of death crowned with glory and honor, that he by the grace of God should taste death for every man." Heb. ii. 8, 9.

"For He hath '*put all things under his feet.*' But when he saith all things are put under him, it is manifest that He is excepted who did put all things under him. And when all things shall be subdued to him, then shall the Son also himself be subject to Him who put all things under him, that God may be all in all." 1 Cor. xv. 27, 28.

The remarks of the apostle in these two passages indubitably establish the following philological and doctrinal particulars:

1. The word "all," as here used, imports every one, or the whole of what it is applied to; since the apostle illustrates its extent of meaning by saying that nothing was left out, God excepted.

2. The phrase "all things" does not refer to inanimate objects, but is used, after the idiom of the Greek, instead of the phrase all persons; since the apostle applies it to those for whom Jesus died, and who shall be "subdued to Him"; and even uses, as equivalent thereto, an expression rendered "every man."

3. Although, grammatically speaking, the verb "hast put" is in the past tense, the *time* intended is clearly future; for Paul manifestly treats it as a prediction, and even says, "We see not *yet* all

things put under him." Note. Using the past tense in declaring future events, — for the most part, however, in poetry, — is a well-known *Hebrew* idiom. See the 53d chapter of Isaiah.

4. To put all things, which is to say, all human beings, under Christ's "feet," or "under him," means to *subdue* them to him; since, in Paul's comments on the phrase, he says, "And when all things shall be subdued to him," — which expression is evidently intended to be equivalent to saying, "And when all things shall be put under him."

5. To be "subdued" to Christ, is to become *subject* to him; for in Paul's quotation of the text from the Psalms, the words "in subjection" appear, as if for the purpose of indicating what is meant by the figure of putting under one's feet. And besides, he tells us that "the Son *also* himself shall be subject," which, of course, is saying that the *others* shall.

From the foregoing specifications, it seems entirely clear, that the doctrine of Paul in regard to human destiny, is, that God will render all human beings subject to Christ. And if all become subject to Christ, how can any be endlessly miserable?

I know it may be *asserted* that some will submit unwillingly, being compelled to yield as is a nation subdued by a foreign Power. But I know also, that Jesus, when arraigned before Pilate, totally disclaimed that manner of dominion. Said He,

> "My kingdom is not of this world; if my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants *fight* that I should not be delivered to the Jews: but now is my kingdom not from hence." John xviii. 36.

In the above, we are instructed by the King himself, who of course understood the genius of

his own government, that His kingdom differs from those of this world in that its specific objects are not *directly* attainable by the use of physical force. The great subduing power, then, through which, in process of time, all mankind are to be subjected to the Son of God, must be — not physical, but — *moral* power, — which, of course, must be brought to bear upon man's moral nature. All, then, who shall become subject to Christ, will most assuredly yield a willing, a hearty, a loyal, a joyful submission to His government.

In accordance with the above, after teaching that all shall become subject to Christ, and that then Christ will be subject to God, the apostle, by way, as it would seem, of announcing *the grand object and design* of those two events, makes use of the following most remarkable language:

"THAT GOD MAY BE ALL IN ALL."

This, certainly seems to be equivalent to declaring that there shall be a perfect spiritual unity among all mankind, between them and Christ, between all and God.

The beloved disciple lovingly says,

"If we love one an other, God dwelleth in us, and His love is perfected in us ..... God is love; and he who dwelleth in love, dwelleth in God, and God in him." 1 John iv. 12, 16.

When God comes to be all in all, He must, by His own inherent love, reign supreme in every heart; and then, most surely, all will love one an other; and love, as saith the Scripture, is the fulfilling of the law; and when all shall fulfil the law, there certainly can be no sin; and when there shall be no sin, there must consequently be no misery.

## CHAPTER XX.

### THE LAST-DAY RESURRECTION.

In the Gospel of John are *seven* texts that contain the expression "the last day;" and a resurrection or raising up is mentioned in five of them. An examination of these seven texts will form the subject of this chapter.

The Greek preposition *en* is connected with the phrase in mention, and is rendered twice "in," and five times "at;" as "in the last day," "at the last day."

One of the texts above alluded to refers professedly to "the last day, that great day;" yet the day mentioned is merely the concluding one "of the feast" of tabernacles![1]

Two of the texts alluded to are often cited to prove that the resurrection of mankind is exclusively future, and that it is to happen simultaneously:

"This is the Father's will who hath sent me, that of all that he hath given me I should lose nothing, but should raise it up again *at the last day*." John vi. 39.

"Jesus said to her, Thy brother shall rise again. Martha said to him, I know that he shall rise again in the resurrection *at the last day*." John xi. 23, 24.

Now let it be *assumed* that by "the last day" is

[1] John vii. 37.

here meant the final termination of human mortality, and the language of these texts will seem perfectly in accordance with the idea that the resurrection of all mankind is future and simultaneous. But let it be understood that by "the last day" is meant the close of the Jewish age, dispensation, or state, and these two texts, with several others, will put on an altogether different aspect. And, strange as such an interpretation may seem, the writer hereof is decidedly of the opinion that the true reference of at least the former of the two is actually to the close of that age; and, of course, that the rising is not to immortality. Various considerations go to establish this conclusion — some of which follow:

I. In three of the texts wherein raising up at the last day is mentioned, our Lord promised to raise up at that time those who should receive and obey His teachings, yet gave not the least intimation that He would raise any others. But the resurrection to immortality is certainly not for such persons alone. The Saviour has elsewhere expressly taught that *all* the so-called dead live to God by virtue of a resurrection. And Paul declares his confident hope "that there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust." [1]

"This is the will of HIM who sent me, that every one who seeth the Son, and believeth on him, may have everlasting life; and I will raise him up *at the last day*." John vi. 40.

"No one can come to me, unless the Father who had sent me draw him; and I will raise him up *at the last day*." Verse 44.

"Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life; and I will raise him up *at the last day*." Verse 54.

From the language of these three texts, — as

[1] Luke xx. 37, 38; Acts xxiv. 15.

highly figurative as some of it is,—it is apparent that the last-day resurrection was promised only to such as should receive and obey the Saviour's teachings. Lazarus, the brother of Martha and Mary, was doubtless such a one; and therefore the statement of Martha as to his rising at the last day, may be regarded as entirely true in word, whether she understood our Lord's meaning in that phrase, or whether she did not. But this rising up being promised to believers, *as such*, it is absurd to suppose that the very same thing was to be conferred, and this too at the very same time, upon the opposite class also.

In reply to this, it may be urged that the Saviour was to raise up at the last day all whom the Father had given him; also, that God had given him all mankind; — hence that the raising not merely of believers, but of all others also, is, truly, to be at the last day, the foregoing argument to the contrary notwithstanding.

It is indeed true that, in a very important sense, all have been given to Christ, he having been constituted the Regal "Heir of all things."[1] But it is equally true that, in an other sense, not all are His either by gift or inheritance. Witness His own words:

"I have manifested thy Name to the men whom Thou gavest me out of the world: Thine they were, and thou gavest them me ..... I pray for them: I pray not for the world, but for those whom thou hast given me ..... Holy Father, keep through thy own Name those whom thou hast given me, that they may be one, as we are." John xvii. 6-11.

It is to be observed also, that in the text, "This is the Father's will, ..... that of all which He hath given me I shall lose nothing," the very expression, "all which He hath given me," indicates,

[1] Hebrew i. 2.

unmistakably, that *some* had *not* been given to him in the sense there intended. The "all" is *limited* by the phrase following it.

II. That the close or ending of the Jewish age, should have been denominated "the last *day*," is quite as natural as that the period reaching from the advent of Christ to the ending mentioned, should have been denominated "the last *days*:"

"God, who at sundry times, and in divers manners, spake in time past to the fathers by the prophets, hath *in these the last days*, spoken to us by his Son." Heb. i. 1, 2.

"This is that which was spoken by the prophet Joel: And it shall come to pass *in the last days*, saith God, I will pour out of my spirit upon all flesh ..... And I will show wonders in heaven above, and signs in the earth beneath .... The sun shall be turned into darkness, and the moon into blood, before that great and notable day of the Lord come." Acts ii. 16-20.

In the former of these passages. "the last days" are plainly represented as being then in progress, and as having begun with our Saviour's ministry. ("These *the* last days" is a literal rendering.) In the latter passage, some of the events of "the last days" are expressly declared to be then *passing;* ("this is that which was spoken;") and, excepting only the arrival of "that great and notable day," the whole is set forth as to be accomplished "before" that day's arrival. And since it is a fact that, when announcing the "*signs*" which should precede the coming judgments of God upon the Jews, the Saviour employed language almost identical with that here quoted by Peter from Joel, the conclusion seems unavoidable that the great and notable day in mention is the time when those judgments came upon them. (See as referred to below.)[1] And since "in the last *days*" is certainly

[1] Mark xiii.24-30; Luke xxi. 20-30.

*toward* the close of the Jewish age, is it not perfectly natural that "at the last *day*" should mean *at* its close? "The last day" is therefore the same as "that great and notable day," namely, the last of the last days.

III. "In the last *day*," according to the Saviour, the unbelievers were to be judged or condemned, as well as the believers to be raised:

"He that rejecteth me, and receiveth not my words, hath one that [*or* that which] judgeth him: the word that I have spoken, the same shall judge him *in the last day*." John xii. 48.

It is entirely certain, from many passages of Scripture, that there was to be *a judgment* at the close of the Jewish age or dispensation; and it is equally certain that the judgment and the rising of the dead to *immortal* life are not, in all The Book, described as accompanying events — a strong circumstance in favor of the position that the phrase, "the last day," as employed by our Saviour, signifies the close of the age then present. (See Chap. xvi. of this work.)

IV. The rewards and punishments which were to be dispensed at the close of that age, or at the coming of Christ in that generation, are set forth in John, 5th Chapter, as in Daniel 12th, under the figure of two resurrections. (See Chaps. xix., xx.) From this circumstance alone, it would seem to be certain that when our Lord, in John, 6th chapter, promised to raise up at the last day those who should believe in Him and obey his requirements, He meant the same as he did, in the preceding chapter, by "the resurrection of life;" and this the more so since, in both the passages, He represents the believer as *having* everlasting or eternal life at that present time. And it would seem equally certain that when, in the 12th chap-

ter, He testified that whoever should reject him and receive not his words would be judged or condemned in the last day, he meant the same as he previously did by "the resurrection of damnation" — properly "of condemnation" or "judgment." Whatever, then, may be meant by the last day resurrection, or by the last-day judgment, one thing seems perfectly clear — the reference of the texts is the same as is that of those wherein are set forth *two* resurrections. If to be raised up at the last day is a resurrection to immortality at the close of the Saviour's reign, then, to come to the resurrection of damnation is to be condemned at the close of His reign, and, of course, finally. But the latter is not true — therefore, not the former.

V. There can be no doubt that in our Lord's reply to the Sadducees "touching the resurrection of the dead," he speaks of a rising to immortality; and the language employed by Him on that occasion is all the same as strictly literal; since the only figure He uses —, that of being "children of," (or "sons of,") — was a common every-day mode of speech.[1] But in the chapter where He tells of the last-day resurrection, a great share of his language is highly figurative — some of it even strangely so:

"I am the living bread which came down from heaven. If any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever; and the bread which I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world ..... Unless ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you. Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life, *and I will raise him up at the last day* ..... He that eateth me, even he shall live by me." John vi. 51–57.

In like manner, when Jesus had said to Martha, "Thy brother shall rise again," (literally,) "shall

[1] Matt. xxii. 23–32; Mark xii. 18–27; Luke xx. 27–38.

be raised," that is, shall be restored to life presently, and she, uncertain whether she might accept His words in that sense, had replied, "I know that he shall be raised . . . . . at the last day," our Lord at once rejoins, "I am the resurrection and the life."[1]

The fact that in near connection with the phrase, "the last day," are found bold and extraordinary metaphors, seems a clear indication that the *raising up* found in connection with that phrase, is not to be taken in the ordinary sense of that expression.

It is likely that the disciples had as good an idea of what Jesus meant by "the last day" as have many of the moderns; but in regard to human immortality, it is certain that even the apostles, at that stage of their discipleship, did not well understand their Master's doctrine. The *question* which they put to Him, no great while previous, concerning a man *born blind*, indicates, plainly enough, that they were as much as *tinctured* with a belief in the Pharisees' doctrine of transmigration, or a resurrection into *this* mode of being. (See Chap. i. of this work.)

The idea of Martha, when she spoke so confidently of her brother's rising in the last-day resurrection, was probably this — that, along with the ancient saints, the deceased disciples of Christ would live again upon earth when He should set up his kingdom. To their understandings, had He not plainly taught this? Addressing some of his non-disciples, and again his disciples, He, at different times, had said:

"Strive to enter in at the strait gate; for many, I say to you, will seek to enter in, and will not be able . . . . . There will be weeping and gnashing of teeth, when ye shall see Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, and all the prophets, in the

[1] John xi. 25.

kingdom of God, and you yourselves thrust out. And they will come from the east, and from the west, and from the north, and from the south, and will sit down in the kingdom of God. And, behold, there are last which will be first," &c. Luke xiii. 24–30.

"The kingdom of God shall be taken from you, and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof." Matt. xxi. 43.

"And He lifted up his eyes on his disciples, and said, Blessed are ye poor; for yours is the kingdom of God." Luke vi. 20.

"Fear not, little flock; for it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom." Luke xii. 32.

A few hints toward an exposition of John vi. 39, in accordance with the views put forth in this chapter, are perhaps called for in this place.

The "all" which, *in this text*, God is said to have given to Christ, I understand to be Christ's apostles, taken collectively. It is true that the word rendered "all" has here the *neuter* form, and so is followed by "it," in the same gender; but this, *in Greek*, it not at all inconsistent with its application to persons. Besides, the word rendered "should lose," applies commonly to the losing of persons by their being destroyed; as of soldiers, by a general, &c. The "all" being also in the singular number, the "it" in the last member of the sentence probably personates the "all"; though, as some one has suggested, it *may* stand merely for Judas. (?)

Against this it may be urged that since the Father's will is here declared to be that Jesus should not lose any that had been given to him, the text in hand can not refer to the apostles, seeing that, in a text now about to be quoted, the loss of one of them is undeniably admitted by the Saviour himself:

"Those whom Thou gavest me I have kept, and none of them is lost but the son of perdition." (Properly, *in this place*, "the son of loss.") John xvii. 12.

The true answer to this, is, that though, during a short time, Judas was actually lost to our Lord, that is, as to being a friend of His cause, it was *only* during a short time that he was thus lost. When, in prayer with His disciples, late in the evening of Passover night, Jesus spoke of having lost the son of loss, Judas was absent, having left, at or before the close of the supper, with the design (, which he seems to have harbored for a day or two,) of acting as "guide" to those who wished to arrest Him. Later in the night, he returned, and pointd Him out; but early the next morning, and as soon as "he saw that He was condemned," he "repented," and did all that he could do in his Master's behalf. [1] And subsequently, in the early times, when the disagreeable fact of Christ's having suffered as a malefactor was strongly and persistently urged against His religion, the ample and unexceptionable testimony which Judas, in word, deed, and suffering, * had borne to

* "In word, deed, and suffering." In *word*, "I have sinned in that I have betrayed the innocent blood"; in *deed*, by returning the price of his Master's betrayal; in *suffering*, by the overpowering mental emotions which, in one way or an other, occasioned his death.

Admitting that Judas really committed suicide, as is commonly supposed, it is by no means certain that he *hanged* himself, the rendering of the Common Version to the contrary notwithstanding. The word rendered "hanged himself," in Matt. xxvii. 5, does not signify to hang or suspend, but has the sense of choke, strangle, or suffocate. (In Acts x. 39, Gal. iii. 13, Matt. xxii. 40, &c., quite an other word is used.) And there is no evidence that he committed suicide at all, excepting the bare fact that *apegxato*, verbally "was suffocated," or "was strangled," *may* have a reflective sense, and so signifiy to suffocate or strangle one's self.

The expression rendered "and went and hanged himself," is, literally, "and going forth, was suffocated." And Luke, in Acts i. 18, tells us concerning Judas, that "falling headlong," which is to say head foremost, "he burst asunder," &c.

Query. Had Judas suspended himself by the neck, and by that

[1] Matt. xxvii. 3–5.

our Saviour's innocence, must have been, to the early Christians, inestimably valuable. Hence —, "traitor" as he was, or "devil," in the Scriptural sense, — he as really assisted in the introduction and establishment of Christianity as did any of his fellow-apostles.

The words of Christ in prayer for His apostles, — "those whom THOU hast given me," — with the subsequent remark of John, — "that the saying might be fulfilled which He spoke, 'Of those whom THOU gavest me have I lost none," — are very similar to the language of the text in hand. So, after praying for his apostles, he adds, "Neither pray I for these alone, but for those also who shall *believe on me* through their word; that they all may be one, . . . . . and that *the world* may know that THOU hast sent me, and hast loved them as Thou hast loved me." [1] And as a counterpart to this, observe that in Chap. i, after declaring the Divine will concerning all that God had given him in the sense there intended, — verse 39, — He immediately speaks of God's will as to "every one who seeth the Son and *believeth on him*," — and presently announces what himself will do "for the life of the world." [2]

Taking all the circumstances into the account, it seems to me a perfectly clear case, that as in the quotation from the 17th chapter of John, so in that from the 6th, our Lord first speaks of his apostles, then of believers in general, then of the world.

The following startling announcement of Christ

means suffocated himself, and afterward fallen, as some have imagined, would he not have fallen *feet* foremost?

N. B. — Suffocation from vehement mental emotion, as violent grief, fear, or anger, is no unheard-of thing; and *it is said* that such cases have sometimes been attended with a falling out of the bowels.

[1] John xvii. 20–23; xviii. 9. [2] John vi. 39, 40, 51.

to Martha, perhaps claims some remarks in this connection:

"I am the resurrection and the life: he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live. And whosoever liveth and believeth in me, shall never die." John xi. 25, 26.

The adverb "never," in this text, is a rendering of five Greek words — the double negative, "*ou me*," (equivalent to "by no means,") and the phrase "*eis ton aiona*"; (partly defined in Chap. vi;) so that the phrase rendered "shall never die", is, literally, (leaving the latter half untranslated,) "shall by no means die *eis ton aiona*." In this text and a few others, I suppose *aion* to have the sense of "*spirit*," and *eis* to signify "*in*." I subjoin a rendering of the text in hand more nearly literal than that in the Common Version, — and which gives also my understanding of the phrase in mention:

"I am the resurrection and the life. He who believes in me, even though he has died, shall live; and every one living and believing in me, shall by no means die spiritually." Literally, "die in the spirit." (Aion.)

With this compare a more literal rendering of, Pet. iv. 6:

"For, for this cause was the gospel preached also to dead persons, that they might indeed be judged with men in flesh, yet live with God in spirit." (Pneuma.)

It seems to me also, that in a few other texts, the Greek phrase in hand has the sense of "spiritually" or "in spirit:"

"Whosoever drinketh of the water that I will give him shall by no means thirst *eis ton aiona;* but the water that I will give him shall be in him a well of water springing up into *aionios* life. John iv. 14.

"This is the bread which cometh down from heaven, that a man may eat thereof, and *not die* ..... If any man eat of this bread, he shall live *eis ton aiona;* and the bread that I will

give is my flesh, which I will give for *the life* of the world," "Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath *aionios* life." "Not as your fathers did eat manna, and are dead: he that eateth of this bread shall live *eis ton aiona*." John vi. 50, 51, 54, 58.

If, in the foregoing texts, the phrase *eis ton aiona* is certainly used as an indicator of *time*, it must mean either for an endless duration, or for a period indefinite — that is, for eternity, or for an age. But did the Saviour really promise this, that those believing in Him shall live endlessly? If so, the fair inference is, that the opposite class are to be annihilated — a conclusion wholly at variance with our Lord's own position, that *all* the so-called dead "live" to God, and that thay *can not* "die any more." [1] Did He promise merely that believers shall live for an age? The inference then is, that, at the end of the age, they, too, will sink into nihilism, in like manner as all the unbelievers will have done before them. I can not receive either this or that. To my understanding, the promise is, that Christian believers shall have the life "proper to the spirit," or what perhaps is the same thing, the life "pertaining to the age," that is to say, to the Christian age, which life is manifestly *spiritual*. I therefore render *aionios* "spiritual", where that term is joined with *life;* and, in some texts, I render *eis ton aiona* "spiritually" or "in spirit."

[1] Luke xx. 38, 36.

## CHAPTER XXI.

### THE DISEMBODIED STATE AND A SIMULTANEOUS UNIVERSAL RESURRECTION.

It is commonly taught as a Christian doctrine, that the spirits of the departed are all in a disembodied state, which state or condition is also called "the intermediate state," as coming *between* the death of an individual and what is usually called "the general resurrection." For it is also taught that except in the case of Jesus, and perhaps in a few other instances, there has been no resurrection yet; — that is, to an immortal embodiment; — and that at some future period, near, or distant, or very distant, the resurrection day will arrive, in which all human spirits will be reëmbodied, either at once, or at two successive periods. The above-mentioned doctrines are, in my view, errenoneous; and I propose to offer, in this chapter, two or three reasons against their correctness:

1. The Apostle Paul, in a certain passage declares as follows:

> "We know that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of [*or* from] God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens." 2 Cor. v. 1.

In the same connection with the above, he also, in a text which has been quoted in a previous

chapter of this work, speaks of being, for the present, "*at home* in the body," that is, in his earthly one, of course. (See Chap. xii.) And this language seems to me to be not such at all as the apostle would have employed had he expected at death to enter upon a disembodied state. According to the figure he here uses, if it was his destiny, on quitting his earthly body, to remain for ages without a body, then was he soon to be totally unhoused; and the condition in which he is at present, in which he has been from that time to this, and in which he must need be hereafter for we know not how long, is that of being in an unsheltered state, destitute entirely of habitation or home. Yet this agrees not well with the Christian idea in regard to the circumstances of departed saints.

Nor does this houseless and homeless condition accord any better with the spirit of the apostle's language. Viewing the dissolution of his body as a not far distant event, he looks forward to his condition thereafter with evidently pleasing anticipations. (See as below.)[1] Had he represented his earthly body as a place of *confinement*, and spoken of being liberated therefrom at death as a prisoner released from prison, this had been in perfect keeping with the doctrine of the disembodied state. Instead, however, of employing that kind of language, he —, as we have just seen, — makes mention of his "earthly *house*," speaks of being "at *home* in" it, and declares in substance, "If this should fall to pieces, we know we have an other. This is but a temporary structure; that a place of permanent abode." It therefore seems entirely certain to me, that he expected to become an inhabitant of a heavenly house on quitting the earthly one.

[1] 2 Cor. iv. 16; v. 8.

2. In the passage in hand, the apostle, in continuation of his theme, goes on thus:

"For in this [, that is, 'in this house,'] we groan, earnestly desiring to be clothed upon with our house which is from heaven: If so be that being clothed, we shall not be found naked."

Here, *if* the rendering in the Common Version is certainly correct, the apostle superadds the figure of *clothing*, and — blending it with that of shelter — expresses his very earnest desire to be *clad* with his heavenly house, (a strange mingling of metaphors,) so that he shall not be found *naked*, that is without a bodily organization. He even repeats this sentiment as follows:

"For we who are in this tabernacle [or 'temporary house'] do groan, being burdened: not for that we would be unclothed, but clothed upon, that mortality might be swallowed up by life."

In this text, he acknowledges his earthly house or clothing to be in some sort incommodious; yet he is careful to present the idea, once more, that he does not therefore wish to be in an unclothed or unsheltered state — he would rather be doubly clothed or sheltered than to be thus.* Now if it was his belief that in the economy of God all mankind are to become "undressed spirits," thus to remain until the final termination of human mortality, how came he to cherish so strong a desire against such a state?

* "He would much rather be doubly clothed," &c. In the Jewish manner of speaking, a denial followed by an affirmation, or an affirmation followed by a denial, is frequently equivalent only to a *comparison*, designed to set forth a strong *preference* for one of the things mentioned. The sentiment of the apostle in the text above quoted, is therefore most probably this, and no more than this, that he would much sooner choose to be doubly embodied than to become disembodied, though, as I view the case, he had not faith nor fears as to either. Compare Jer. vii. 22, 23, with 1 Sam. xv. 22, and Prov. xxi. 3. Also, the first and last half of the verse, in Hos. vi. 6.

3. The text from Paul's writings, — quoted in Chap. v., — in which text he assures the Corinthian brethren that upon the supposition of there being no resurrection of the dead, those having fallen asleep in Christ are in a perished state, seems to teach, and with entire clearness, that the resurrection is indispensably necessary to any after-death life; but this, of course, could not be the true doctrine if it were a fact that the dead are living without having experienced any resurrection. It is therefore claimed that by this text, the common doctrine of the disembodied or intermediate state, as also, by consequence, that of a simultaneous, universal resurrection, are directly and effectually negatived.

It is fully admitted that the Pharisees of our Saviour's day held the doctrine of a disembodied state. This followed unavoidably from their belief in a transmigrational terrestrial resurrection not always happening very soon after death. It is certain, too, that some of the Jews, at a later period, held to a simultaneous resurrection of at least a certain class of mankind. But the question now in hand is not what doctrine was held or taught by the rejectors of Christianity, but what by Christ, and afterward by His apostles.

## CHAPTER XXII.

### A GENERAL OBJECTION AGAINST MANY OF THE POPULAR VIEWS RELATING TO THE RESURRECTION.

In this chapter, it is proposed to present a couple of Scriptural arguments bearing upon a certain point, which point, when established, furnishes a general objection against all or nearly all the doctrines objected to in the preceding chapters.

"We have testified of God that He raised up Christ: whom He raised not up, if so be that the dead rise not. For if the dead rise not, then is not Christ raised ..... Then those also who are fallen asleep in Christ are perished. If in this life only we have hope in Christ, we are of all men most miserable." 1 Cor. xv. 15–19.

The above passage was adverted to in our last chapter for the purpose of showing that the apostle considered the resurrection as indispensable to the after-death life. It is quoted here for a similar purpose — as furnishing convincing proof that the resurrection of the dead is in progress.

We have seen in Chapters xi., xii., that the dead are in a *knowing* state; — they are therefore in an *unperished* state, as a matter of course. Yet Paul says of the deceased Christians of that age, the ones having "fallen asleep *in Christ*," which here seems to signify having died *hoping* in Christ, —that *they* "are perished" "if the dead rise not."

And, surely, the rest of the dead must be quite as likely to perish as those are who die in the Lord; therefore, without a resurrection, or something quite equivalent to it, there would, according to the Scriptures, be no after-death life for any. But there scripturally *is* an after-death life; and moreover, that life is a present verity; and further, this always has been a fact ever since death first entered the world; — from all which arises the conclusion —, to me unavoidable, — that "the dead are raised" one after an other, in like manner as the living die.

It will readily be perceived that the doctrine of a progressive resurrection stands directly or indirectly opposed to most or all of the popular doctrines which have been objected to in this work; and that any argument going to establish the doctrine named, must, of course, constitute an objection against those alluded to. Thus,

In regard to the resurrection of the earthly body, no stronger argument against it could be adduced than would be one which should conclusively show that the resurrection of the dead is progressing. So of the disembodied or intermediate state, — of the literal death of the spirit, — of its protracted sleep after the death of the body, — and of the loss of immortality in Adam. These could in no way be more effectually disproved, than by presenting an argument establishing the position that the resurrection is now going on, and that the same thing was true in the days of the patriarchs. The like may be said of the common doctrine of two resurrections, as also that of the simultaneous rising of all, — with the one or with the other of which are connected the popular doctrines of a general judgment, of endless punishment, and of annihilation in at least two of its forms. Yet the

kind of objection above described, bearing directly or indirectly against all the doctrines above named, the writer has, in previous chapters, aimed wholly to omit, choosing to present only such objections as are the least intimately related to his own views, and endeavoring to examine the opinions of others altogether apart from his own.

2. In the 15th chapter of 1st Corinthians, — well known to be a professed dissertation upon the resurrection, — the apostle, in the course of his remarks, argues thus:

> "As is the earthy,
> such are they also that are earthy; and
> as is the heavenly,
> such are they also that are heavenly." Verse 48.

The *supplied* words in the above-cited text, are the *second* in each line. They are evidently necessary to the sense, only "is," in the first line, should be *was*, the sense clearly being that

> As Adam *was*, such are mankind in this mortal state; and
> as Christ *is*, such are mankind in the immortal state.

That the above is indeed the true sense, is abundantly manifest from the language of the contexts:

> "The first man Adam was made a living soul; the last Adam was made a quickening spirit." Verse 45.
>
> "The first man is [*or* was] of the earth, earthy; the second man is the Lord from heaven." Verae 47.

Note. Some suppose the *autographic* reading here to have been, "The second man is from heaven, heavenly."

Let us now requote the first-text without the supplied words:

As || the earthy, such || they also that are earthy;
and || ||
as || the heavenly, such || they also that are heavenly."

Note. A literal, though not therefore the best rendering of the above, is,

"As the earthly One, such ones also the earthly ones;
and
as the heavenly One, such ones also the heavenly ones."

In the text now in hand, the apostle recognizes — and, of course, teaches — two special facts. The one fact is known by means of the physical perceptives directed by reason; the other, by means of the spiritual perceptives directed in a like manner. The former is perceived by all men; the latter, by those "to whom it is given." The alleged facts follow:

First. There actually are, in the present time, those "there are earthy," — who are "such" as *was* Adam, the first or earthly man.

Second. There actually are, in the present time, that "that are heavenly," — who are "such" as *is* Christ, the second or heavenly man.

Does any reader fail to perceive that in the language above cited from Paul, the second of the above-alleged facts is actually recognized by the apostle? If so, will he please look again, and take very special notice whether the apostle does or does not say "they also that are heavenly," just as plainly and as positively as he says, "they also that are earthy?"

There can be no dispute that those which the apostle here calls "heavenly," are viewed as being in the immortal state, in like manner as those which he here calls "earthy," are undeniably considered as mortal. The heavenly ones — he tells us — are "such" as is Christ; and Christ — he elsewhere tells us — "being [*or* having been] rais-

ed from the dead, dieth no more; death hath no more dominion over him." [1]

I claim now to have introduced not only inferential, but also positive proofs, that the resurrection or anastasis of the dead is progressing, — there now being, according to Scripture testimony, immortalized human beings just as certainly as there are mortal ones. And I offer these proofs as a sweeping objection against the principal doctrines objected to in the preceding chapters.

Sundry objections against the above view of the resurrection will be attended to in subseqent chapters; and a mass of evidence will be presented in its favor.

[1] Rom. vi. 9.

## CHAPTER XXIII.

### CONCERNING ANGELS.

HAS the subject indicated by the title of this chapter any natural connection with the subject of the anastasis of the dead?

We shall see. The writer is confident not only that the two subjects are naturally connected, but also that they are connected rather closely. The reader may not discover any such connection now, but perhaps he will in the sequel.

The commonly received doctrine concerning angels, regards them as a separate race of beings, higher by creation than man, and of course holding no nearer relation to us than that arising out of the circumstance of their having had the same Creator as ourselves. This seems to have been the almost universal belief, both among Christians and others, from a very remote period; but it is attended with several weighty objections, of which, however, I here mention only the following:

No account is to be found in the Bible of the creation of a race of beings who are angels by virtue of their natures. Perhaps the Scripture which comes nearest to being such an account, is the one containing the incidental remark that God "*made the aions*," which last term the writer hereof considers as synonymous — *in that text* — with the

word for angels. It is not at all certain, however, that the *making*, or causing to be, which is mentioned in that text, has reference to making them living beings. It is quite as natural to suppose that it refers to the making or causing of them to be angels.

In the same connection with the text above alluded to, a Scripture from the Psalms is quoted, "Who maketh His angels spirits." Had this text been put forth upon quite an other subject, and so been rendered, according to the *primary* import of the words, "Who maketh His messengers the winds," we could not fail of perceiving the sense to be this, "Who maketh the winds to be his messengers." Accordingly I consider the true sense of the text to be the same as if the words were arranged thus: "Who maketh spirits his angels, — in which case it would be easy to see that the text refers — not to their creation as living entities, but — to their being put into office as God's messengers or representatives. In continuation of the same subject, the apostle goes on to speak of the angels as being "all" of them "ministering spirits;" [1] and it seems certain that, in this text, the apostle really meant to recognize the doctrine that celestial angels are angels by virtue of their office; since the word here rendered "ministering" properly signifies — not merely *serving*, but — *officially* serving.

It has been held that the angels of the Scriptures are not real beings, but only *appearances*, except in those texts where human mortals are intended. To my mind, an insuperable objection to this opinion is deducible from a declaration of our Lord addressed to the Sadducees. Speaking of mankind in general, He says, "In the resurrection they . . .

[1] Heb. i. 2, 7, 14.

are as the angels of God in heaven." [1] Now, unless it was the doctrine of Christ — as every one knows it was not — that the departed, when raised to an immortal life, are mere appearances, then, according to his teachings, angels are not such, but are living entities, *de facto*. And aside from this, which, to me, is an irrefragable proof of their actual personality, I am entirely sure that —, whatever a *philosopher* might do, — a plain Bible Christian would find it a rather difficult matter to even *imagine* in what way many passages of Scripture could be even plausibly interpreted so that they would even *seem* to agree with the doctrine in question.

It has been held also, that all human beings become angels at death — that

> "How great soe'er their ranks or kinds,
> Angels are but embodied minds;
> When the partition walls decay,
> Men emerge angels from their clay."

There are several objections to the doctrine that all become angels at death, some of which objections seem to me to possess very great force. Thus,

Angels are spiritual servants or helpers. Concerning them the Scripture teaches, as has been already in part quoted, that they are "all" of them "ministering [or officially-serving] spirits, sent forth to minister for those who" —, as the Common Version has it, — "shall be heirs of salvation." Now the sum total of all who have ever died so greatly exceeds the whole number now on the earth, that to suppose *all* the dead to be needed in the capacity of angels for the purpose mentioned, or for human assistance in all scripturally mentioned ways, is to suppose what is utterly unreasonable and incredible.

[1] Matt. xxii. 30.

In the memorable conversation of our Lord with the Sadducees, — already adverted to, — he declares concerning human beings, "In the resurrection they . . . . . are as the angels." Now had He said, "In the resurrection they *are* angels, the doctrine in question might somewhat reasonably be considered as thereby proved true. But His saying, as he did, that they are *as* the angels, which is to say that they are to some extent *like* them, is manifestly inconsistent with the idea that we necessarily become angels by virtue of the resurrection.

As has been observed in Chap. xii., it was actually taught by the Saviour that there were at that time, "*in the presence* of the angels of God," "in heaven," beings who were affected with "joy" at the repentance of sinners.[1] But if all human beings become angels at death, what beings could the Saviour have alluded to?

It is also held in regard to spiritual angels, that there are *evil* ones, as well as good ones. This dogma lies at the foundation of the common belief in a personal spiritual devil; and it hence is found, at least by implication, in the creeds of most Christian sects. The nearest approach which the language of Scripture makes towards seeming to teach this doctrine, is in those two passages where mention is made of the *devil's* angels, who, of course, could be no other than evil ones.[2] But as it is not quite certain from the Scriptures, that the devil is, or ever was, a spiritual angel himself, the assumed fact that his *angels* are spiritual beings, may well be doubted. It is God who makes spirits his angels.

Even allowing that the devil is really just what

[1] Luke xv. 7, 10. [2] Matt. xxv. 41; Rev. xii. 7-9.

he is commonly supposed to be, it does by no means follow that his angels are any thing but *men*, engaged, — knowingly or otherwise, — in the devil's cause. In these days, and in full view of the common belief, we occasionally hear of "the devil's *preachers*," who — it is asserted — have been *sent forth* by his Diabolic Majesty to proclaim his "devilish" Doctrine. Now admitting this to be *true* of the preachers to whom such language is applied, what impropriety — let it be asked — could there be in styling those preachers the devil's angels or messengers?

As with the devil's angels, so with satan's *ministers*, mentioned in a text which will be referred to presently. These were obviously *men* who were opposed to pure Christianity; and the term "satan," in that text, imports, religiously, much the same idea as "the opposition" does now, politically.

There are certain passages of Scripture which, to many minds, seem to recognize the existence of a personal spiritual evil being, belonging to the same race of beings as the celestial angels, he having once been a celestial angel himself. To discuss this topic at length, does not come within the scope of this work. I will, however, comment as briefly as may be upon a few of the texts that are supposed to favor this doctrine; and I will also present two or three objections against it, arising mostly from facts that are generally overlooked:

1. Though the Scripture writers sometimes apply the word angel to other agents than the angels of God in heaven, it is no where said, in the Scriptures, that such so-called angels are devils. Thus in 2 Peter, allusion is made to "the angels [*or* messengers] that sinned"; but they are not

styled devils, nor is the term satan applied to them. So in Jude, allusion is made to "the angels [*or* messengers] who kept not their first estate;" but the passage makes no mention of devils, nor of satan.[1]

2. In like manner, it is no where taught, in the Scriptures, that, in spiritual actuality, either satan or the devil, is, or ever was, an angel. Paul, indeed, speaks of satan's being "transformed [or "metamorphosed"] into an angel of light;" but the apostle obviously did not mean to say that such metamorphosis had *made* satan an angel of light, any more than he did that satan's "ministers" had become "ministers of *righteousness*" by a like process. Jesus also said, on a certain occasion, "I beheld satan as lightning fall from heaven"; yet that satan descended from the spiritual heaven, any more than the lightning does, is not at all intimated, much less is any thing said of his being, or having been, one of the angels of God.[2]

3. Were the facts set forth in the two preceding paragraphs just the *reverse* of what they are, it would not at all follow that the common doctrine on this subject is the Scriptural one. Simon Peter and Judas Iscariot were both of them "sent forth" by our Lord to preach the gospel; and hence might have been properly called Angels, as well as Apostles; (for the words are of similar import;) and yet Jesus addressed Peter as "satan," and spoke of Iscariot as being "a devil."[3] Hence if it were the case — just as it is not — that, in the Scriptures, some angels are styled devils, and the devil or satan spoken of as an angel, those facts would be far from proving that there are evil angels of the description commonly believed in.

[1] 2 Peter ii. 4; Jude 6. [2] 2 Cor. xi. 13–15; Luke x. 18.
[3] Matt. x. 5; Mark viii. 33; John vi. 70.

Besides, the apostle Peter declares of "the devil," that he, "as a roaring lion, walketh about;" and, in the book of Job, "satan" is set forth as confessedly in the habit of "going to and fro in the earth";[1] but the "*angels*" alluded to by both Peter and Jude, in the texts from their epistles lately referred to, are represented by those writers as being securely chained up.

In the Revelation, we read of a certain symbolical being who is announced as "the angel of the abyss," (or "of the bottomless pit," as the Common Version has it,) and also as the "king" of a band of *locusts* which issued from the smoke of the abyss, and came upon the earth as a scourge. But though this insect king with his band went forth as a *destroyer*, and hence "in the Greek . . . . . hath his name Apollyon", (really "Apolluön", from the verb "*apollumi*", to destroy,) he is by no means described as a diabolical being, but as the leader of a host sent forth to execute the judgments of God upon certain wicked men, and strictly "commanded" *not* to do "any" of that kind of damage usually done by such insects. If, therefore, this abyss-angel were set forth by the Revelator to be a real entity, the common doctrine in reference to *evil angels*, would not be proved true thereby. Nor —, it may be added, — does that doctrine derive the least support from any *reasonable interpretation* of the figures.

The fact that the king of the locusts is set forth as "the *angel* of the abyss," may lead to an understanding of what was symbolized by the abyss. If in this place, as in some other places, the word for angel signifies *representative*, then we have it that he was a representative of the placé he emerged from. And as the *name* of this Locust Leader was

[1] 1 Peter v. 8; Job i. 7.

"Apolluon" or "Destroying One", which name shows him to be a personification of *destructiveness*, or the propensity to destroy, what can the abyss be but a symbol of "*apoleia*," or destruction? and what its being "opened," but a figure of its display in the actions of men? Note. When those under the influence of destructiveness are not allowed to "kill," — and this, as we read, was the case with those locusts, — in what way does the propensity naturally manifest itself but in *tormenting?* Accordingly, this is just what the locusts are here represented as doing.[1]

In a subsequent part of the book, the Revelator speaks of a certain "beast," as ascending out of the abyss, and as going into *apoleia;* (rendered "perdition;) and in several forms of expression occurring afterward, the idea symbolized by the figure of destroyers returning to destruction whence they came, is plainly set forth. Thus mention is made of God's being about to "destroy those who destroy the earth;" and it is declared, "He who leadeth into captivity, shall go into captivity"; — that is, he who destroys the *liberty* of others, or causes them to lose it, shall lose his own, or have it destroyed; — also, "He who killeth with the sword, must be killed with the sword; — all which goes to show that (, with one apparent exception,) the word for bottomless pit or abyss, and the word for perdition or destruction, are, in the Revelation, employed as synonymous terms.[2]

The apparent exception above alluded to, is where "the dragon" of the Apocalypse is represented as being *imprisoned* in the abyss,; — thus making the abyss to be, to him, *confinement* instead of destruction. But confinement is specifically the

[1] Rev. ix. 1–11. [2] Rev. xi. 7, 18; xiii. 10; xvii. 8, 11.

loss or destruction of one's liberty; so that the abyss is actually synonymous with *apoleia* in this text also.[1]

In the history of king Saul, we read that "an evil spirit from the Lord troubled him." Now, if by an evil spirit is here meant — *not* a particular temper of mind, but — a personal spiritual being, then, seeing this spirit was "from the Lord," we ought perhaps to infer that the existence of spiritual evil angels is truly a Scriptural doctrine, even if its opposite is such also. I believe, however, that some good commentators consider this evil spirit to have been a hypochondriacal state of mind; and that its being said to be "from the Lord", imports that it came upon him as a punishment. That Saul's affliction was thought at the time to be *some* sort of illness, whatever was thought as to its cause, appears plainly enough from his advisers' recommending *music* as a *remedy*, assuring him that thereby he should become "well," which assuring, as we learn, proved to be well founded:

"And it came to pass when the evil spirit from God was upon Saul, that David took a harp, and played with his hand: so Saul was refreshed, and was well, and the evil spirit departed from him." 1 Sam. xvi. 14–23.

In the history of king Ahab, mention is made of "a lying spirit," who "stood before the Lord" in heaven, and was sent to the earth on professional business. But the passage is evidently a *parable*, and even has its moral lesson plainly expressed.

Ahab, king of Israel, and Jehosaphat, king of Judah, proposed going to battle against the Syrians. J. said, "Inquire, I pray thee, at the word of the Lord to-day." A. assembled the prophets, — four hundred or so, — who all said,

[1] Rev. xx. 1–7.

"Go up to Ramoth-Gilead, and prosper: for the Lord will deliver it into the hand of the king." J. then said, "Is there not here a prophet of the Lord besides, that we might inquire of him"? A. mentioned one "*Micaiah*"; but added, "I hate him; for he never prophesied good to me, but always evil." The prophet was however sent for; and on being questioned as to whether they would do well to go, or not, he also answered, though evidently in a tone of manifest irony, "Go ye up, and prosper," &c. — *echoing*, as we may say, the words of the other prophets. A. then said to him, How many times shall I adjure thee that thou say nothing but the truth to me in the name of the Lord? M. made answer in the following parable:

"I saw all Israel scattered upon the mountains, as sheep that have no shepherd: and the Lord said, These have no master; let them return therefore every man to his house in peace."

Ahab now said to Jehosaphat, "Did I not tell thee that he would not prophesy good to me, but evil? Micaiah replied in the words of the passage in question:

"Therefore hear the word of the Lord: I saw the Lord sitting upon his throne, and all the host of heaven standing on his right hand and on his left. And the Lord said, "Who shall entice [or "persuade"] Ahab, king of Israel, that he may go up and fall at Ramoth-Gilead? and one spoke saying after this manner, and an other, saying after that manner. Then there came out a spirit, and stood before the Lord, and said, I will entice [or "persuade"] him. And the Lord said to him, Wherewith? And he said, I will go out, and be a lying spirit in the mouth of all his prophets. And the Lord said, Thou shalt entice [or "persuade"] him, and thou shalt also prevail: out, and do even so."

The *moral* of this parable, and indeed of the other also, immediately follows, in these words:

"Now therefore, behold, the Lord hath put a lying spirit in the mouth of these [or "all these"] thy prophets, and the Lord hath spoken evil against thee."

Now, as regards the question who or what this lying spirit was, I consider the above account to import simply this, that Ahab's prophets were all actuated by a lying disposition. Each prophet had thus his own spirit of falsehood to move him. But how could an individual personal being have been in the mouths of so many men at once?[1]

The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, in the course of an argument designed to show, Scripturally, that Jesus Christ is much higher in office than are the angels, puts forth the following language, upon which language I base an argument against the existence of evil spiritual angels, which argument is, to me, perfectly conclusive:

"But to which of the angels said He at any time, Sit on my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool? Are they not all ministering spirits, sent forth to minister for those who shall be heirs of salvation?" Heb. i. 13, 14.

In this passage, *five* things are particularly to be observed:

1. The latter question, "Are they not all" &c., is fully equivalent to an affirmation, — its sense manifestly being that they all *are* what it is asked if they are not.

2. The angels are not only described as "sent forth," that is, as being each a *messenger*, which is the original signification of angel, but they are also described as "spirits."

3. They are declared to be "*ministering*" or serving spirits, which is the same as saying that they are spiritual servants or helpers.

[1] 2 Chron. xviii. 3-27; 1 Kings xxii. 4-28.

4. Their business is "to minister *for*" the persons mentioned, not against them.

5. It is taught that the spiritual angels are "*all*" of them such as are therein described.

From the foregoing results the following:-

SPIRITUAL ANGELS ARE ALL GOOD BEINGS.

## CHAPTER XXIV.

### CONCERNING ANGELS — CONTINUED.

In regard to the official business or occupation of angels, it appears that, according to the Scriptures, they have been sent from God to man on various errands; yet, as I view the case, all such errands relate (, though some of them rather remotely,) to one and the same great End, —— the progress and elevation of the human race, physically, mentally, morally, and religiously, through the general diffusion of Christianity with its attendant influences, as the great Means among those instituted by the universal Father for the promotion of that end.

Among the recorded occasions upon which angels have appeared, may be reckoned the following:

The conveying of intelligence concerning coming events of personal and general interest; as to Abraham, Daniel, Zacharias, Mary, and John the Revelator; —

The deliverance of some from perilous circumstances, and the preservation of others in situations of danger; as of Peter from prison, and of Daniel among the lions; —

The soothing, encouraging, and strengthening, of persons in extreme trouble; as of Paul, when

about to be shipwrecked; and of Jesus in Gethsemane, when about to surrender himself, in compliance with the will of God, to a violent and most ignominious death; —

The annunciation of important existing facts; as the birth of the Saviour, to certain shepherds near Bethlehem; his resurrection to some of the female disciples at his tomb; —

And so forth; &c.

I consider it to be not at all improbable also, when taken in connection with other facts, that the repentance or reformation of sinners (, which —, startling as the announcement may seem, — the Saviour actually assures us causes "*joy*" even "in heaven,") is made known to the heavenly inhabitants by angels.[1]

It appears, too, from the Scriptures, that angels have sometimes exerted a powerful influence over human mortals without making themselves — and perhaps without making the fact of their influence — known to the persons over whom such influence has been exerted. Thus an angel, in conversation with the prophet Daniel, claimed to have confirmed and strengthened "Darius, the Mede," "in the first year" of his reign,[2] which year included the time — or was but a little antecedent to the time — when Daniel, through the envy, malice, and cunning, of his inferiors in office, was cast into a den of lions, with the intent that he should be devoured. Now this was sorely against the will of the king; but he had been entrapped into making of a law with that penalty, and, as it would seem, was constitutionally deprived of both the repealing and the pardoning power; and Daniel having certainly violated the law, it could not well be otherwise than that its penalty must be inflicted upon him.

[1] Luke xv. 7, 10. [2] Dan. xi. 1.

And we read that when he found it was impracticable for him to save Daniel, he addressed this remarkable language to him: — language which it might seem hardly credible should have proceeded from the mouth of a heathen, were we not also told that, at or about that time, an angelic influence was being exerted over him: — "Thy God, whom thou servest continually," said he to Daniel, "*he will deliver thee.*" [1] *

What concerning "*guardian* angels?"

The Scriptures are not altogether silent upon the subject of angelic guardianship, though not so full and explicit as perhaps would seem to us desirable.

The guardianship of angels over some persons, and this by the express appointment of God, is obviously *promised* in the simple language of one of the Psalms, an extract from which is given, below, and a small part of which is quoted in Matt. iv. 6, and in Luke iv. 10, 11:

Thou shalt not be afraid for the terror by night; nor for the arrow that flieth by day. nor for the pestilence that walketh in darkness; nor for the destruction that wasteth at noon-day. A thousand shall fall at thy side, and ten thousand at thy right hand; but it shall not come nigh thee..... There shall no evil befall thee, neither shall any plague come nigh thy dwelling. *For He shall give his angels charge over thee,* to keep thee in all thy ways. They shall bear thee up in their hands, lest thou dash thy foot against a stone." Ps. xci. 5-12.

The doctrine of the existence of guardian angels is at least *favored* by the second *dream* of King Nebuchadnezzar, which dream the prophet Daniel recognized as "showing the decree of the Most

[1] Dan. vi. 16.

* "*He will deliver thee.*" This, perhaps, should be rendered interrogatively; as "Will He not deliver thee?" But thus rendered the speech of Darius is still very remarkable.

High." In this dream of the king, "*a watcher* and a holy one came down from heaven," &c.[1] (See the account.)

As relating in a *direct* manner to the subject in hand, let us now once more advert to that text which teaches that angels are all of them ministering or officially-serving spirits, sent forth to minister for those who —, according to the common rendering, — shall be heirs of salvation. What less *can* be meant in this text, than that at least a share of the business of angels on earth, is to do for, or attend on, or in some way serve, the persons therein intended?

In a certain place, the Saviour exhorts and declares as follows:

"Take heed that ye despise not one of these little ones; for I say to you that in heaven their angels [, or their angels in heaven,] do always behold the face of my Father who is in heaven." Matt. xviii. 10.

In this text, the phrase "little ones" must mean either children, in the household sense, or else those persons of maturer age who, in the Scripturally intended sense, have become "*as*" children See the context. But understanding the phrase this way, or that way, affects not the point now in hand. Nothing can be clearer than the fact that, according to the Saviour, there were at that time some on earth who *had* angels in heaven! In other words, there were angels then whose *home* was in heaven, and who at the same time were, in some proper sense, the angels OF the little ones in mention. Or, there were angels in heaven, and there were little ones on earth; and it was a fact in relation to these earth-dwelling ones, that at that very time *some* of the angels mentioned were "*their* angels."

[1] Dan iv. 13, 24, &c.

In the text now under consideration, what description of angels can have been meant other than *guardian* angels — "watchers," put in "charge" of the individuals intended — "ministering *spirits*, sent forth to minister *for*" them, as their particular circumstances might at any time require?

As to which are meant in the text alluded to, children, or Christians, it may be observed that our Lord, in addressing his disciples on that occasion, had been mentioning children, he having placed a child in their midst, having spoken of becoming *as* children, and having assured them that that person is greatest in heaven's kingdom who humbles himself as a child, &c. (The Common Version has it "little child," "little children.") He then, in three texts, — the one that has been quoted, an other, soon to *be* quoted, and a third, in the same connection,— speaks in an especial manner concerning "*little* ones," using — *not*, as He *had* been doing, the word for *children*, but — the plural of *mikros*, little, — a term having no *special* relation to children, any more than to other small entities.

In the text now about to be quoted, he, by a proper rendering, expressed himself thus:

"But whoever shall insnare one of these little ones, the ones believing in me, [*or* who believe in me,] it were better for him that an upper millstone were hanged about his neck," &c.

The explanatory expression in this text, "*The ones believing in me*," seems pretty clearly to indicate that by the "little ones" in the text before quoted, the one having angels in heaven ready to do for them at any time what their needs might require, the Saviour had particular reference to Christian believers. By adopting this view of the subject, that *strange* text mentioning the Apostle *Peter's* "angel," becomes divested of its strangeness entirely.

Peter had been put into prison, and committed to the care of four times four soldiers, as special keepers—probably twice, if not four times, the usual number. This the Christians all seem to have known; and they offered unceasing prayers in his behalf. One night, as has been intimated, he was released from prison; and proceeding to the house of John Mark, where a numerously attended prayer meeting was being held, he knocked at the gate or outer door for admittance. On his voice being recognized, the overjoyed portress, forgetting to admit him, ran hastily in, and announced that *Peter* was without. They at first charged her with being insane; then said, "It is his angel"; but were soon most delightfully "astonished" at finding it to be Peter himself.[1] Now what could those Christians have meant by Peter's "*angel*", other than one of those angels whom Jesus had spoken of as being in some proper sense the angels *of* those persons whom He was pleased to denominate "little ones"?

It may be proper to offer some remarks upon the latter part of that text mentioning "those who shall be heirs of salvation." The common rendering of the text was doubtless put forth in view of that now somewhat antiquated doctrine which teaches that only a select number of the human race were ever designed to be the recipients of salvation in the immortal state. But supposing that that doctrine were indisputably the doctrine of the author of this text, the common *translation* of the text is not the less faulty. In the Greek, the proper future tense does *not* there occur. The expression might be rendered "who are *about* to be heirs," or "who *were* about to be heirs", but not properly "who *shall* be heirs." Nor is the

[1] Acts xii. 1–19.

one, nor the other of these rival renderings, unquestionably the right one. In suitable juxtaposition, the Greek phrase in question might mean "those intending", "those preparing," "those delaying," or "those desiring to be heirs."

Again. The word rendered "salvation" may or may not have reference to the future state; and, having relation to assistance in general, it may import either deliverance, preservation, restoration, or protection, according to the manner of its application, and the subject to which it is applied. So also, though the *special* sense of the word rendered "to be heirs" is to receive by heirship or inheritance, it *may* — and sometimes does — signify to receive in some other manner.

If, therefore, the following proposed rendering shall be very seriously objected to, the proposer thereof will be very far from being very greatly surprised:

> "But to what one of the angels did He at any time say, 'Sit thou on my right hand until I make thine enemies thy footstool?' Are they not all officially-serving spirits, sent forth into service for those desiring to receive assistance?" Heb. i. 13, 14.

Have all persons angelic guardians?

To me, the Scriptures do not seem to speak in a *direct* manner concerning this. As I view the case, whatever they teach upon this subject they teach by mere implication.

If the common rendering of the text which mentions "ministering spirits" were certainly correct, the fair inference from that text would be, that some certainly will *not* be "heirs of salvation", and that such persons lack spiritual helpers entirely — a perfectly consistent arrangement, since if I am not to be saved, what good could "twelve

legions of angels" do me as regards salvation? But I can not accept that rendering as expressive of the Scriptural sense intended; and as I understand the text, no such narrow inference can be fairly deduced from it.

In that text where mention is made of "little ones" and "their angels," it is well worthy of observation (, and no one can fail to observe it who will use his observing powers,) that the Saviour is not announcing, in a *direct* manner, the fact that such *have* angels. He speaks as if *that* fact were understood and admitted, — and so proceeds to put forth a declaration concerning the *dignity* —, so to speak, — of their angels, when compared with those of others. As if He had said, with expressive emphasis upon certain words, "Be cautious as to undervaluing my humble followers; for I assure you that *their* angels are recognized in *heaven* as angels of the highest rank:"

"Take heed that ye despise not one of these little ones; for I say to you that in heaven their angels do always," &c.

May not others have angels of a grade suitable to their moral standing?

So in regard to the passage quoted from the Psalms. If, in reading that passage, a proper *emphasis* shall be placed upon *the right words*, it will be perceived that the promise to an individual of a certain character, that God will give his angels charge over *him*, &c., does by no means imply the entire *absence* of a like charge over those *not* possessing that character in full perfection:

"There shall NO evil befall *thee*..... He shall give His angels charge over *thee*, to keep *thee* in ALL thy ways." And so of the rest.

May not others be in charge of angels to a less extent?

The powers or capabilities of angels are, of course, to be learned mainly from the Scripture accounts of their doings.

That they have exercised the gift of prophecy, has been abundantly shown by adverting to communications made to Abraham, Daniel, and others.

That they possess the faculty of speech, or at least of producing impressions upon the human brain identical with those we receive from articulate sounds, appears from many instances. The angel who released Peter from prison, *spoke* to him, bidding him rise, gird himself, dress his feet, put on his mantle, and follow him. An angel addressed the shepherds on the plains of Bethlehem in articulate language; and voices, as of a multitude, were heard by them, praising God in words which were not only heard, but understood.[1]

That they are possessed of physical strength, or at least of that which seems identical with it, appears not only from the release of Peter, as just adverted to, but also from a previous similar release of all the apostles, concerning which it is related that "the angel of the Lord by night opened the prison doors, and conducted them forth." An angel also "rolled back the stone from the door" of the tomb where the body of Jesus had been deposited.[2]

That they are able to control the movements, if not the volitions, of even ferocious beasts, appears from the account given by Daniel as to the means by which he was preserved from harm while confined all one night with lions. Said he to king Darius, "My God hath sent His angel, and hath shut the lions' mouths, that they have not hurt me."[3]

[1] Acts xii. 7–10; Luke ii. 10–14. [2] Acts v. 19; Matt. xxviii. 2.
[3] Dan. vi. 22.

That they have the power of neutralizing the action of the most powerful chemical agents, would seem to be shown by the circumstance that when, by command of king Nebuchadnezzar, Daniel's three friends were cast into a heated furnace, from which they afterward came out unburned, a *fourth* was seen in the furnace with them, and the king said, "Blessed be the God of Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego, *who hath sent His angel*, and delivered his servants who trusted in him."[1]

That they are capable of unfavorably affecting the conditions upon which bodily health and life depend, appears from various Scripture accounts. A king of Assyria came against Judea, with intent to take Jerusalem, and subjugate the nation; but "the angel of the Lord went forth and smote in the camp of the Assyrians" 185,000 men; and the king abandoned the enterprise. Concerning one of the Herods, it is related that an angel "smote him," and he soon expired.[2]

Some are strangely desirous of accounting for these and similar events without angelic agency. We are accordingly told concerning the account of Herod's death, that the language employed is only the Jewish manner of saying that God inflicted a disease upon him. I submit whether it is not a manner —, Jewish or otherwise, — of saying that God inflicted a disease upon him *through the agency of an angel.* So it has been taught that the angel who smote so many to death in Sennacherib's army, was only the poisonous wind from the desert. Now, admitting the wind to have been present, — and *perhaps* it was, — may not that be more properly deemed *the instrument* wielded by the angel in smiting them?

[1] Dan. iii. 28. [2] Isa. xxxvii. 36; Acts xii. 23.

That angels are capable (, as even reason teaches,) of affecting the health of human beings favorably as well as unfavorably, appears, Scripturally, not only from the language of the 91st Psalm, quoted while on the subject of guardian angels,) but also from an account in the New Testament, that, at certain seasons, the pool of Bethesda in Jerusalem was rendered *sanative* by an angel.[1]

That angels can exert an imperceptible influence over human beings, as has been before observed, appears not only from the case of king Darius, already adverted to, but from that of Cyrus also. We read that in the first year of the reign of Cyrus, and in order "that the word of the Lord by the mouth of Jeremiah might be fulfilled," relative to the Jews being captives in Babylon seventy years, and then being released from captivity, "the Lord stirred up the spirit" of the king in such a manner, and to such an extent, that he issued a proclamation for their return to their own land, and for the rebuilding of the temple at Jerusalem.[2]

That the Divine Being, in moving the mind of king Cyrus to do what had been predicted should be done, really acted upon him by angelic agency, appears plainly from what an angel told Daniel in relation to Cyrus:

> "The prince of the kingdom of Persia withstood me one and twenty days: but, lo, Michael, one of the chief princes, came to help me; and I remained there with the kings of Persia." Dan. x. 13.

What — if any thing — concerning the late so-called "spiritual manifestations"?

*If* such phenomena, in whole, or in part, are any thing BETTER than a sheer delusion, then, in whole,

[1] John v. 4. [2] Ezra i. 1–4.

or in part, they are not only a species of Divine revelation, — a continuation of the ancient ministry of angels, — but they are actually an outgrowth — so to speak, — of Christianity itself, — are parts and parcels of that "manifestation of the Spirit" which an apostle said was given to every man to profit withal; — are included in those "gifts," "diversities of gifts," "differences of administrations", and "diversities of operations," mentioned and alluded to by that apostle and others; — yea, they are granted in the manner, by the authority, and for the purposes, set forth in the Scriptures referred to below.[1] But as regards the "*if*" at the commencement of this paragraph, let each decide for him or her self; and may God preserve us from delusion, — may He keep us from unreasonable incredulity.

[1] 1 Cor. xii. 4–11, 28–31; Eph. iv. 7–16; Rom. xii. 6–8; 1 Pet. iv. 10, 11; John xiv. 12.

## CHAPTER XXV.

### CONCERNING ANGELS — CONCLUDED.

As regards the *nature* of angels, which is to say their mode of being, I take the ground that they exist each in a spiritual, incorruptible, immortal organization, as distinguished from that of Man in the earth-life, whose bodily organism is described in the Scriptures as "natural," or rather animal, — as "corruptible", and also "mortal."

The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, when speaking of Christ as having been in some sense inferior to the angels, mentions his partaking of flesh and blood like other persons, so that thus he might die, — which the angels can not, — and might deliver others from that bondage caused by the fear of death. He then, by a literal rendering, makes this observation, in which it is obvious that the true subject of the verb is *death:*

"For doubtless it [that is, "death"] takes not hold of angels; but of the posterity of Abraham it takes hold." Heb. ii. 16.

In this text, the idea sought to be illustrated by the apostle, — namely this, — that Christ was "a little lower than the angels," in that they are not subject to death, but He, being of the posterity of Abraham, *was* thus subject, is in no small degree

*obscured* by the common rendering, though perhaps not eclipsed totally:

"For verily he took not on *him the nature of* angels; but he took on *him* the seed of Abraham." (Common Version.)

From the Scripture accounts of the doings of angels, as for example, their speaking, their manifesting physical strength, &c., the fact of their possessing some kind of bodily organization would seem to be abundantly manifest; but whether such organization were permanent, or were only assumed for the several occasions respectively, might not perhaps be entirely clear. The Scriptures do not, however, leave us altogether in the dark upon this subject. In that memorable conversation of our Lord with the Sadducee doctors, the terms in which he speaks of the condition of human beings in the resurrection state, seem calculated to teach us somewhat concerning the organization of angels:

"In the resurrection they . . . . . are as the angels of God in heaven." Matt. xxii. 30.

"Neither can they die any more; for they are equal to [or "like"] the angels." Luke xx. 35, 36.

By "children of the resurrection" are undeniably meant those who have been raised. Such — the Saviour assures us — can not die. They are therefore properly immortal. That we shall have *bodies* in the resurrection state as truly as we have here, will be by few — if by any — disputed. Our present bodies are Scripturally denominated "*mortal* bodies," and we *can* die; yea, as the Scripture also has it, "we must *needs* die"; [1] and, of course, we *shall* die. In the resurrection state we shall *not* die; yea, we *can* not die; — shall we not then possess *im*mortal bodies?

[1] Rom. viii. 11; 2 Sam. xiv. 14.

One of the given reasons why the children of the resurrection can not die, is, that they are *like* the angels. Now it can not but be true that just as far as we when raised *shall* be like angels, so far the angels now *are* like what we shall be when raised. It is Scripturally incontrovertible, then, that angels possess permanent *bodies*, spiritual, incorruptible, immortal, glorious, &c., as is or will be the case with human beings having passed the resurrection.

What as to the *origin* of angels?

Though I regard as erroneous the doctrine that all the departed become angels at death, and even the poetic fancy that all the good, and even all the innocent, become such at death, I am till constrained to the belief that angels are departed human beings. I deem that this view of their origin is not only in harmony with all that the sacred historians narrate concerning angels, — not only rendered highly probable by fair legitimate inferences from a great variety of Scriptural facts and statements; — but also, that it is directly taught in the Scriptures, and taught too in very express terms.

In the book of "The Revelation of Jesus Christ,"—erroneously styled "The Revelation of St. John the Divine",— one of the angels (, if not also an other,) who showed and communicated various things to John, said afterward to him, "I am thy fellow-servant" — to which is added, in one text, "and of thy brethren the prophets," — in an other, "and of those who have the testimony of Jesus." What less can either of these declarations be rightfully taken for, than as a distinct acknowledgment, on the part of the speaker, that he himself was a human being, and that he *had*

been a person in the flesh? (See Rev. xxii. 9; xix. 10.)

To this it will be at once objected, by some, that the Revelation is a book of Allegories; and hence that, as testimony in this case, a quotation from that book can not properly be admitted.

In answer to this objection, I remark as follows:

The book of the Revelation, though mostly allegorical,— professedly so,— is *not* of that character *wholly*. It contains accounts of various visionary scenes; and it abounds in highly figurative language; and no intelligent person supposes that the texts describing such scenery, and couched in such language, (and these, by the way, make up the most of the book,) ought to be *literally* taken in proof of the truth of *any* doctrine. Yea, it being a fact that the visions are seemingly of doubtful *interpretation*, their introduction *at all*, as testimony upon a disputed point, if not of doubtful propriety, is at least of doubtful utility. But it is a fact notwithstanding all this, that the book is partly of an historical and didactic character, not any more metaphorical than are most other parts of the Scriptures; and I claim that what I have quoted from the book belongs to an historical and didactic portion of it, and that its language should therefore be taken in the usual sense of such expressions.

Let us consider this point more at length.

The book commences thus:

"The Revelation of Jesus Christ, which GOD gave to Him, to show to his servants things which must shortly come to pass; and He sent and signified it by his angel to his servant John: who bore record of the word of God, and of the testimony of Jesus Christ, and of all things that he saw."

I take it upon me to affirm that unless the whole book is a mere myth, or collection of myths, the

passage above cited is an historical one, and presents literal truths,— some of which truths are, that GOD had given a revelation to Jesus Christ; that such revelation was subsequently communicated to John, to be by him communicated to others; and that at least the principal medium of communication to John was an *angel.*

Take now a passage from near the close of the book, after the account of the visions is concluded, — the description of the things seen and heard "in spirit" finished:

"And he said to me, "These sayings are faithful and true: and the LORD God of the holy prophets sent His angel to show to His servants the things which must shortly be done." xxii. 6.

Some of the angels seen by John in vision were likely symbolical personages; yet in the text just cited, it is most certainly taught that a real, spiritual, celestial angel of God,— (an angel even of HIM who is styled "the LORD God of the holy prophets,"—) was really and personally employed in the communication of at least *some* of the things therein revealed.

It is indeed said in the same chapter with the above, "I Jesus have sent mine angel to testify to you these things in the churches;" and this angel may be thought to be John, sent as the accredited messenger or representative of Jesus Christ to the said churches. Such an interpretation of this text would be in perfect keeping with the fact that the seven messages sent are not addressed to the seven churches respectively, but to their respective angels or representatives. But if this interpretation were without doubt the true one, that fact would not at all invalidate the fact presented in even the first verse of the book, that the "revelation" presented in the book was "signi-

fied" *to* John *by* an "angel," and that that angel was "sent" from either Christ or God.

Now take what presently follows the averment that "the Lord God of the holy prophets" had sent his angel, &c.

"And I John saw these things and heard them. And when I had heard and seen, I fell down to worship before the feet of the angel who showed me these things. Then saith he to me," &c. xxii. 8, 9.

With this compare a passage from chapter 1: (verses 9, 10.)

"I John, who also am your brother and companion in tribulation, . . . . . was in the isle called Patmos . . . . . I was in the spirit on the Lord's day," &c. (Literally, "in spirit." So also in chapter iv. 2; xxi. 10.)

As this last quoted passage is evidently an historical one, so also is the other. The style of the two is precisely similar, and is quite diverse from that of the main body of the book. If the quotation from the first chapter is not an historical passage, the book is evidently a fiction. But the same may be said in regard to the quotation from the last chapter; for the dictional character of the two is the same. When, therefore, the Revelator says, "And I John saw these things," &c., we may be sure that he has dropped the allegorical mode of expression, and is communicating in a plain, narratory, matter-of-fact style and manner.

Let us now re-quote our main proof-text, with its connections, and also present the parallel passage. Whether the two passages are the words of one and the same angel, (said, and afterwards, in substance, re-said,) or whether they are the utterances of two different angels, is probably now impossible for any one certainly to decide; nor perhaps is the solution of this question a

matter of any great importance. Those having "the testimony of Jesus" are clearly the Christians of that age; and if by "the prophets" are meant persons prophesying *before* the advent of Christ, then the two passages are the utterances of two angels. But to the quotations:

"And I John saw these things and heard them. And when I had heard and seen, I fell down to worship before the feet of the angel who showed me these things. Then saith he to me, 'See thou do it not: for I am thy fellow-servant, and of thy brethren the prophets, and of those who keep the sayings of this book: worship God." Rev. xxii. 8, 9.

"And I fell at his feet to worship him. And he said to me, 'See thou do it not: I am thy fellow-servant, and of thy brethren who have the testimony of Jesus: worship God; for the testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy." Rev. xix. 10.

Whatever any other person or persons may think in regard to the teachings of the passages just cited, the writer hereof thinks, and believes, and is sure, that those passages teach, distinctly and positively, that at least *one* of those whom the Saviour denominates "the angels of God in heaven," belongs to the human race! And if one, then others, then all; — (why not?) — I therefore receive, and believe, and hold fast, as a Bible truth, the doctrine that each of the spiritual celestial angels mentioned in Scripture, was once a human mortal on the earth.

In considering the doctrine that *all* become angels at death, I adduced as an objection the language of Christ in reference to the departed, that they are *as* the angels. This I deem a valid objection against that doctrine; but no objection at all against the doctrine that *some* of the departed are appointed to that office. In regard to their organization, or mode of existence, all are *as* the angels, and the angels are *as* all; but not all *are* angels, since only a comparatively small number can possibly be needed in that capacity.

Certain Scriptures are supposed to recognize the existence of various races of angels; but it is quite as natural an understanding of those texts to consider them expressive of different degrees of official rank, as it is to consider them declarative of different grades of being. What is said of Michael, the archangel, does not necessarily lead to the conclusion that he belongs to a higher race of beings than do his fellow-angels.

The Scripture testimony herein presented from the Revelation, being direct, is, with the writer of this, sufficient to fully settle the question as to the *origin* of angelic beings; but he adds the following indirect evidence, for the benefit of such, if any, as may need it.

The fact that the Scriptures contain no historical account of the creation of angels, as such, seems to be a fair and legitimate argument, of considerable force, in favor of the doctrine herein advanced, that angels are departed human beings.

The fact that in the early history of the human race contained in the book of Genesis, no account is given, for many years, of the appearance of any angels, *has* been adduced (by some one) as an argument in favor of their Adamic origin.

The fact that celestial angels have always appeared in human form, and are, in the Scriptures, sometimes even called "men," *may* have some proper bearing upon this subject.

By supposing angels to have once been human mortals, the circumstance of their having always manifested a very great degree of interest in the well-being of mankind, is more naturally and fully accounted for than it is upon any other theory.

In the light of this doctrine, certain *questions* of considerable interest to most persons, are quite

as readily and satisfactorily answered as they can be by adopting some other view of the subject:

1. In the heavenly life, shall we remember having existed here?

Most certainly we shall. Did not the angel who declared himself to be of the number of John's brethren that had "the testimony of Jesus," remember having been a Christian believer and witness on earth?

2. Shall we recognize, and be recognized by, those whom we have known, and who have known us, in the earth life?

This much *must* be true — almost certainly, more. Those who come after us *we* shall recognize; those who have gone before us will recognize us. Was not the Revelator known by his angel-brother? Did not Stephen know the Saviour when, by spiritual sight, he saw him in heaven? When Christ appeared to John in Patmos, was not the recognition mutual?

3. In the spirit world, shall we know any thing of the affairs of earth?

We shall know concerning the affairs of the earth-world all that will be desirable to be known. Much in which mortals feel the most intense interest, will doubtless be estimated by us at about the rate we now estimate those things and events which are the most interesting to very young children. We shall rejoice over the repentance of sinners, — shall know, of course, that there are sinful practices here, and also what they are, — shall be aware of the sad consequences of wrong-doing, in both an individual and a social point of view, — shall be cognizant of the progress of human reform, in all its branches, aspects, and bearings, — shall not be ignorant as to who are engaged in the promotion of that cause, &c., &c.;

— which manifestly supposes some acquaintance with *many* things and matters appertaining to terrestrial affairs.

4. Shall we sometimes visit the earth sphere?

We *may*, if we are permitted; we *shall*, if we are sent; we shall be *sent*, if that shall be necessary; and in such an event we shall be angels, as truly as is Gabriel, at least until our mission is accomplished.

It will now be perceived —, and, as I trust, with entire clearness, — that, allowing the origin of angelic beings to be such as is herein argued, a very intimate connection exists between the Scripture doctrine concerning angels, and the Scripture doctrine concerning the anastasis of the dead. The Scriptures undeniably teach that human beings in the resurrection world are *as* the angels, or *like* them; and now, if angels are departed human beings, then the angels are human beings who have been raised. The existence of angels, then, is not only a proof of an after-death life for man, — which, by the way, is a fact not generally recognized, — but it is also, in a multitude of instances, a manifest verification of the occurrence of that process denominated anastasis. The Sadducees, who denied any anastasis of the dead, were consistent in denying also the existence of angels.

If the Scriptures really teach that angels are human beings who have passed the resurrection, then, to be consistent, they should also teach that the resurrection of at least some human beings takes place soon after the death of the body. To show that the Scriptures do actually teach such a resurrection for mankind at large, will be the subject of the next three or four chapters.

## CHAPTER XXVI.

### A PRESENT OR PASSING RESURRECTION.

It is related of the great Teacher, that being in and near Jerusalem during the last few days of His mortal life, He was attacked, polemically, by the chief Priests, the Scribes, the Elders of the people, the Herodians, the Pharisees, and the Sadducees, — each party, in turn, endeavoring, by artful questions, to draw Him into saying something that might be brought, as an accusation, against him.

The Sadducees, as we have seen, denied there being any resurrection — a denial which our Lord, in his reply to them, treats as equivalent to a denial that there is any life for man after the death of the body. It will be recollected, too, that Josephus represents them as holding that when the body dies the soul dies with it. (See Chap. i. of this work.) They appear to have taken the ground that the Jewish Scriptures, particularly the writings of Moses, are silent as to any after-death life, — therefore that such a life is not.

The Sadducee doctors had invented, as it would seem, and perhaps for that very occasion, the ever-since familiar case of the seven deceased brothers, with the deceased woman who, in life, had successively been the wife and widow of the whole seven. Calling His attention to the well-known

circumstance that the law of Moses sometimes requires a man to marry his brother's widow, they narrated their case, — containing six instances in one family where this requirement had been complied with, — and then demanded of Him, as to those seven men, whose *wife*, in the resurrection, this seven-times widowed woman would rightfully be.

In replying to the Sadducees, Jesus proceeds to show them that, in regard to the subject in hand, they had *erred* greatly ; and further, that the cause of their thus erring was their ignorance of the Scriptures, and of the Divine power or capability. Their errors, thus arising, seem to have been, First, the assumption that life after death, if a reality, must needs be such as the Pharisees taught ; and Second, the notion that even the writings of Moses, to say nothing of the other Scriptures, are really silent as to the after-death life.

The Saviour endeavors to show to the Sadducees and all in attendance, that the fact of Jehovah's saying to Moses, " I am the God of Abraham," &c., is a clear proof that the patriarchs mentioned, though dead as to their bodies, were yet actually alive, else God could not at that time have been their God ; — also, that as certain as it was that those patriarchs were then living, so certain it was that they were living in some other than this earthly state. He would have His hearers all consider too, that the universal FATHER, who, of course, must be disposed to do for HIS offspring whatever is truly desirable, is abundantly capable of bringing mankind into a state of existence higher than the present — even into a heavenly, angelic, immortal one.

The substance of our Lord's reply to the Sadducee doctors, is given, in varying language, by

the first three evangelists. Not to cite the whole of the passage from Exodus but once, their accounts are as follows, according to the Common Version:

*Matthew.* "Ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures, nor the power of God. For in the resurrection they neither marry, nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels of God in heaven. But as touching the resurrection of the dead, have ye not read that which was spoken to you by God, saying, 'I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob'?[1] God is not the God of the dead, but of the living." xxii. 23–32.

*Mark.* "Do ye not therefore err, because ye know not the Scriptures, neither the power of God? For when they shall rise from the dead, they neither marry, nor are given in marriage; but are as the angels who are in heaven. And as touching the dead, that they rise: have ye not read in the book of Moses, how in the bush God spoke to him, saying, 'I am the God of Abraham," &c. He is not the God of the dead, but the God of the living: ye therefore do greatly err." xii. 18–27.

*Luke.* "The children of this world marry, and are given in marriage: but those who shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world, and the resurrection from the dead, neither marry, nor are given in marriage: neither can they die any more: for they are equal to the angels; and are the children of God, being the children of the resurrection. Now that the dead are raised, even Moses showed at the bush, when he calleth the Lord 'the God of Abraham', &c. For He is not a God of the dead, but of the living: for all live to Him." xx. 27–38.

In the text from Exodus adduced by our Lord against the Sadducees' doctrine, the word "am" has nothing corresponding to it in the original Hebrew, the expression being literally "I the God" &c. There can be no doubt, however, that the verb *be*, in time present, is really *understood* there; for common sense teaches thus much; and Jesus argues from the text as though such a word were in it; and the Sadducees take no exception

[1] Ex. iii. 6.

to His doing so; and in the Gospel by Matthew, the ellipsis is actually filled by the proper Greek term. (Eimi.) Besides, as is generally known, the Hebrew has no present tense; and it is therefore common, in that language, to indicate simple being, in time present, by the *absence* of a verb; as when Abraham, and Moses also, being called by name, respond, "Here I," which our translators, with manifest propriety, render into English, "Here *am* I." [1]

It will be seen that, according to Matthew, when Jesus cited from the book of Exodus the text alluded to, He cited it as presenting somewhat "*touching the resurrection of the dead.*" * We have it, then, from the highest Christian authority, that that text actually does teach something relating directly to the subject in hand.

From our Lord's argumentation, as learned from the meager abstracts furnished by the evangelists, the conclusion forces itself upon my mind, that the true Christian doctrine as to the *time* of the resurrection, is, that it is *all along*, — so to speak, — in an extended present, each subject of the resurrection being raised at the death of the body. The principal points in His remarks necessitating such a conclusion, are the following:

1. The *life* our Saviour proves for the patriarchs named, which life presupposes their resurrection, and from which He deduces a like destiny for all, belongs manifestly to an extended present. God was, and had been, their God; He is not, at any time, the God of the dead; He is, at all times, the God of the living; — therefore those patriarchs were alive at the time specified, and they had been

* According to the teachings of Christ and, after Him, Paul, future life presupposes a resurrection. See Chap. v. of this work.

] Gen. xxii. 11; Ex. iii. 4.

alive ever since their bodily demise. And it being true, according to Christ's manner of treating the subject, that their being thus alive evinces that they had been raised, the conclusion therefore legitimately follows that the resurrection takes place with each individual on his quitting the earthly body.

2. According to Luke, the natural conclusion of our Saviour's argument, and in its full magnitude, namely, that *all* the dead live, was brought out by Him in due form: "HE is not a God of the dead, but of the living: *for all live to* HIM." Now there can be no dispute that in the proposition, "all live to Him," the Greek verb rendered "live" is actually in the present tense; and from considering in what company the proposition is found, it seems clearly evident that the *time* intended is present time. Thus, that God is not a God of the dead, and that He is the God of the living, are propositions obviously true in any and every period of human existence. Nor could this extended time be in any way so conveniently expressed as it now *is* by the use of the present tense. Yet appended to these two propositions is the one now in hand; — "all live to Him"; — and why is not the present tense in this, indicative of the same division of time as it is in those, namely, an extended present? According to the Scriptures, however, if the departed *do* live, — if they are "living," — it follows that they "are raised."

3. It is also true, according to Luke, that the Saviour argued, in express terms, "that the dead are raised." Thus he makes Him to have said, "Now *that the dead are raised*, even Moses showed," &c. If in this place it really was not the design of Luke to represent the Saviour as teaching a resurrection occurring in present time, it

seems at least unaccountable that he should have employed just such language as he might have employed, with entire propriety, had he had that design and no less. Even the verb *egeiro*, to raise, is here used in the *passive* form ; (*egeirontai* = are raised ;) and it is obvious that the present of the *passive*, — which, philosophically, is present time beginning back in the past, — is *not* naturally taken in a future sense.

4. Mark uses precisely the same verbal inflection as Luke, — *egeirontai*, — although, in the Common Version, the verb is — from some cause — rendered as if in the *active* voice. By such rendering he is made to make Jesus say, "As touching the dead, that *they rise :* have ye not read," &c. The expression, "they rise" is indeed most naturally understood as equivalent to "they *do* rise"; yet it *can* have a future signification put upon it with much less apparent violence to the ordinary rules of language, than can the *proper* rendering, "they are raised."

The text, "for all live to Him", is not generally taken to mean that this is so in fact, but merely that it is so to God, — it being supposed that, with Him, all time is an "eternal Now." But what is there in the text or context necessitating such an interpretation? Obviously, nothing. The interpretation adverted to is necessary only for the purpose of bringing the text to harmonize with the doctrine of an all-future, simultaneous, universal resurrection. The attendant circumstances do by no means indicate the assumed metonymy of tense. On the contrary, they allow, and even require, that the proposition shall be taken in its simple, grammatical import.

So, too, as regards the text setting forth that what was said to Moses at the burning bush shows

"that the dead are raised." I affirm that there is no good reason for understanding our Lord's language there in any other than its plain, obvious sense, namely, that the dead experience the resurrection one after another, even as they have died. Various objections, however, may be started against this view of the subject:

I. It may be objected that the tenses of verbs in the Greek Testament are not always reliable as to time. Let this be admitted; and what then? The texts we have been arguing from in this chapter, contain no indefinite tenses, no dubious forms of verbal inflection. However much of force the objection may have elsewhere, it clearly, in this place, has none at all. *Ego eimi* = I am; *Theos esti* = God is; *Pantes zosi* = All live; *Hoi Nekroi egeirontai* = The Dead are raised; — are all plain examples in the present tense. N. B. The Greek words are here arranged English-wise.

II. It is also objected that, with express reference to the resurrection, *the future tense* actually occurs in many texts; and the claim is, that while the present tense is often put for the future, the future is never put for the present.

The words "many," often," and "never," in the above objection, are stronger terms than the facts of the case will warrant. "Several," "sometimes," and "seldom," would be unexceptionable. But the objection is of no force. The use of a future tense is not, of itself, any argument against the views herein advanced. In two classes of texts, the future tense is as clearly in harmony with a progressing resurrection as it is with any other.

The classes of Scripture texts above alluded to, comprise, First, those relating to persons *then alive in the flesh*,— and, Second, those which include *all mankind*.

"God hath both raised up the Lord, and *will* also raise up *us*." 1 Cor. vi. 14.

"As we have borne the image of the earthy, *we shall* also bear the image of the heavenly." 1 Cor. xv. 49.

"As in Adam all die, even so in Christ *shall all* be made alive." 1 Cor. xv. 22.

"There *shall* be a resurrection of *the dead*, both of the just and unjust." Acts xxiv. 15.

In an address to a Christian assembly, might not the language of the texts just cited, and of any other texts belonging to either of the classes mentioned, be as appropriately adopted by a speaker holding that the resurrection is now in progress, as it could be by one who holds that —, leaving out the case of Christ and perhaps a few others,— all of the resurrection is yet in the future? Could not the former as properly as the latter announce his convictions thus?: Jesus was raised, and *we shall* be; yea, *all will* be made alive, even as all die."

III. It has been contended that in those texts where the present tense occurs in speaking of the resurrection, the *meaning* must be future; for that in one such place it is expressly declared that God "calleth those things which are not as though they were." Specious as this appears when thus stated, I have to observe that the text does by no means affirm what the objection virtually claims — that God does thus in reference to the resurrection. A *quickening* of the dead, which *implies* their resurrection, is indeed mentioned,— it being affirmed that God "quickeneth the dead, *and* calleth"— as stated. Yet it is easy to see that the quickening and the calling have no declared dependence one on the other, the two propositions being simply joined, *end to end*, as it were, by the all-connecting copulative, "and."

As has been observed, it is not in reference to

the resurrection that, according to this text, God calls non-entities as if entities. But, in the same sentence, as we have seen, a very important statement is made which *does* refer to the future life in all probability. God "quickeneth the dead." It is even glaringly apparent that this expression much more naturally conveys the idea that the quickening process was being enacted all along, than it does that it was all to be enacted an unknown number of centuries thereafter.

The *occasion* of the apostle's saying that God calls non-existing things as if existing, was this: He —, the apostle,— had just adverted to the historical fact that God said to Abraham, "I *have* made thee a father of many nations,"— when not only was it true that those nations were "not," but it was in like manner true that even his son *Isaac* had no actual existence, in whose line exclusively the posterity of the patriarch was to be reckoned. [1]

[1] Rom. iv. 17; Gen. xvii. 5, 21; xxi. 12.

## CHAPTER XXVII.

A PRESENT OR PASSING RESURRECTION.—CONTINUED.

IV. It has been mentioned as an objection against a present resurrection, that, according to both Matthew and Mark, the Sadducees, in the well-known question which they put to our Lord, made use of the future tense, and asked, "whose wife *shall* she be?" And, according to Mark, they also used the future tense of the verb "rise," saying, "In the resurrection, therefore, when they *shall* rise, whose wife," &c. It is hence argued that the Sadducees had not understood the Saviour as teaching a resurrection happening at death, but, on the contrary, one *to* happen at some future time; therefore that the Christian resurrection is exclusively future.

I reply, *if* the Sadducees had any such understanding as to the time of the resurrection, they likely got it from the Pharisees. These are known to have held that, at least in some instances, the rising of the dead from among the dead was delayed for a considerable length of time. But allowing that Christ's questioners had really understood *Him* thus, are we quite sure that, with their stubborn prejudices, (not to mention their stupidity,) they had understood the great Teacher aright? Note. That the Sadducees, in their

question, really used the future tense of the verb "rise," is by no means indisputable.

V. Another, and a prominent objection, is, that, in the course of His reply to the Sadducees, Jesus himself made use of the future tense. It is admitted that He did thus, in a couple of phrases, according to the Common Version; yet it is to be observed, First, that the correctness of some of its renderings, in this place, is at least questionable; and Second, that, so far as *the first part* of His reply is concerned, there would seem to be no impropriety in his using the future tense, seeing that, in one phrase at least, that distinction of time had certainly been employed by his opposers.

Our Saviour's reply to the Sadducees consists of two parts: First, he shows them that their anti-resurrection argument, involved in the case presented by them, is altogether irrelevant; Second, in continuation of the subject then in hand, he argues from the Scriptures against their doctrinal views, and in favor of his own.

In the Common Version, Mark and Luke —, though not Matthew,— each represents our Lord as using a future tense *once*, in the first part of His reply; but not one of the three is made to represent Him as using such a tense in the second part, where He argues from the Scriptures. And, as has been before intimated, seeing that His captious opposers had made use of the future tense in putting their question, the use of a like tense in exposing the irrelevancy of the case upon which their question was founded, might reasonably be supposed to arise from a laudable desire to avoid even the appearance of caviling.

It is, however, a fact, that throughout *both* parts of our Lord's reply to the Sadducees, He did not in a single instance, employ a tense unequivocally

future. Where the Common Version makes Him say, "For when they *shall* rise," &c., the verbal inflection given by Mark will hardly be claimed as a proper future; and in Luke, where the Saviour is represented as saying, "But those who *shall* be accounted worthy," &c., the tense given by the evangelist is certainly an indefinite past; a literal understanding, as to tense, being, "But those having been," &c. It is not here affirmed that the aorist participle, *kataxiothentes*, "having been accounted worthy," may not have a *present* signification; but it is affirmed that, aside from creeds, no reason exists for supposing its sense, in that text, to be *future*. And various considerations lead directly to the conclusion that it was meant to be taken in its natural, grammatical import, denoting the present possession of a former reception of a past action. Some of these considerations follow:

1. That the expression in mention is to be taken in a future sense, is both grammatically and rhetorically very improbable, from the fact that it is only in the poetic prophetic portions of the Scriptures, that the past tense is at all likely to be put for the future. In the didactic and narrative parts, that Hebraistic figure of speech is seldom or never met with — at least in the New Testament.

2. If we knew nothing of the original, it would be proper to suspect an erroneous translation here; as it seems entirely inconsistent for Jesus to have employed the language ascribed to Him by the Common Version. The expression, "those who shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world," &c., is exactly calculated to convey the idea that some shall *not* be thus accounted; and the necessary inference from this would be that, for such persons, there is no existence in any other

world than the present. But we might know that Jesus did not teach thus; for by showing that the so-called dead are "living," he claims to show that they "are raised"; and then, by declaring that "all live", he lets us know that by "the dead," He means *all* the dead; — and we, by putting that and that together, could not well avoid seeing that His doctrine truly was that all the dead are raised, and, of course, have all been accounted worthy to obtain that world so different from this.

3. If it would have been inconsistent for Christ to say, in plain terms, "those who *shall* be," &c., how much more inconsistent for him to say that by mere *construction* — using language which requires to be *interpreted* in a future sense, though, to sound and sight, seemingly expressive of time past! It is totally incredible, then, that the real import of His language is such as is indicated by the Common Version.

VI. It may now be urged, as against a present resurrection, that even if the proper rendering of the phrase in question is really such as is herein argued, — "those having been [*or* who have been] accounted worthy", — still the *infinitive*, "to obtain," may denote future time, its time being certainly subsequent to that of the antecedent verb; so that the passage may teach an exclusively future resurrection after all.

This argument, if not far-fetched, is at least far-stretched. An infinitive, following a verb or participle in *present* time, may naturally enough have a future sense; but following a verb or participle in *past* time, it will hardly transcend the present. But this needs not be insisted upon; for the time of the infinitive, in this case, is demonstrably present. "Those having been account-

ed worthy to obtain" the boon mentioned, are represented by the Saviour as "being" actually in possession of it.

To be "children of this world" or "aion", is, manifestly, to be living entities in the present mode of being. "To obtain that world" or "aion", is, as manifestly, to come to be livers in the after-death or resurrection mode of being. So, also, it is entirely manifest that to be "children of the resurrection", is to have been raised — is to have been subjects of the process denominated anastasis.

Does now the blessed Redeemer here promise that by-and-by, in the lapse of ages, after the expiration of a length of time known only to the Omniscient One, all the dear "children of God" —, those "accounted worthy to obtain that world," &c., — shall, by virtue of being raised, become —, what they are not to be till then, — "children of the resurrection"? Nay, verily. So far from even *intimating* the existence of such a state of things, he positively and unequivocally affirms that those "accounted worthy to obtain that world," &c., "*are* the children [*or* sons] of God, *being* the children [*or* sons] of the resurrection." We may thus see that the resurrection is as it were the *door* into the spirit world; and that those having entered that world, "are raised."

In continuation of the argument for a present resurrection, as drawn from the passage in Luke which we have been considering, two circumstances may now be worthy of notice:

1. Whatever the authors of the Common Version may have meant by the forms of speech which they employ in this place, the plain, grammatical import of their language is, that all such persons as, at some future time, "*shall be* accounted worthy

to obtain" the resurrection world, *do not*, now, enter into matrimonial relations. There are few who hold that marriage is inconsistent with Christianity; and to all except such, it can not but be perfectly obvious that the absence of marriage affirmed in this text, is meant to be affirmed of those who *have* gone to the spirit world, and not of those who are *to* go some time or other. But the *entrance* to that world is through the resurrection, as we have seen; consequently the affirmation of the Saviour in the text in hand, was *not* concerning those who *shall* be accounted worthy, but concerning those who have been thus accounted, or who are. It therefore is literally true that the so-called dead "are raised."

2. It is also affirmed of the persons mentioned, "Neither can they die any more." As with the declared absence of marriage, so with the declared impossibility of death, — there can be no doubt that it applies to the resurrection world, and not to this. The death intended is clearly the death of the body. But the declaration that they can not thus *die*, is obviously equivalent to saying that they are immortal, and therefore that they have departed from this mode of being, and of course have been deemed worthy of the immortal state. Again. They can not "die *any more*". This supposes, indisputably, that they *had* died, and therefore that they had been mortal, but were then quite otherwise. Of whom did the Saviour here speak — of whom could He be speaking, — unless there were some of the human race who even then had been raised to immortality?

VII. It is also objected that, in a certain text, we are informed that "David is not ascended into the heavens." From this it is argued that at that time David was not raised, therefore not others. The

text is often quoted, "For David is not *yet* ascended," &c.; and the import is taken to be the same as saying, in modern popular phrase, "David is not yet gone to heaven." But "heaven" and "the heavens" may not have precisely, the same import; and besides, there is not the least intimation, in either the text or context, that David was *ever* to ascend in the sense there intended. The reference of the text is not to a resurrection, but to a subsequent Regal exaltation.

The text occurs in Peter's sermon at the day of Pentecost. He declares the resurrection of Jesus; cites the words of David, "Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell," &c.; and teaches that David's words as thus cited do not apply to David, but to Jesus. He then announces the exaltation of Jesus to the right hand of God, — quotes also from David, "The LORD said to My LORD," &c., — and sets forth that it was — not David, but — Jesus who was thus to ascend:

"For David is not ascended into the heavens: but he saith himself, The Lord said to my Lord, Sit thou on My right hand, until I make thy foes thy footstool. Therefore let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ." Acts ii. 34–36; Ps. cx. [1]

To a *Jewish* auditory, in whose Scriptures *David* is addressed as "my lord the king," and expressly styled "the Lord's anointed," which is the same as to say, "the Lord's Christ," the argumentation of Peter on the occasion referred to, however it may now seem to us, was doubtless perfectly appropriate and of the kind which, in those circumstances, was imperatively necessary.

[1] 2 Sam. xiv. 17–19; xix. 19, 21; 1 Kings i. 27, 31, 36, Ps. lxxxix. 38, 51; Luke ii. 26.

## CHAPTER XXVIII.

A PRESENT OR PASSING RESURRECTION — CONTINUED

In conversation with some of the Jews, on a certain occasion, our Lord claims to have received from God the capability of rewarding all true believers with everlasting, spiritual, or religious *life:* or, as He also expresses it, of bringing them to a *resurrection* of life; — also, on the other hand, the "authority to execute judgment" upon the unbelievers of that age, or to bring them to a resurrection of *punishment,* judgment, condemnation, or — as the Common Version has it — "of damnation." (See Chaps. xv, xx, of this work.) He claims also, to be doing the same or the like things as His FATHER, alleging that "what things soever HE doeth, these also doeth the Son likewise."

In specifying the acts of his Father and himself, he, in the course of his remarks, observes thus:

"For as the Father raiseth up the dead, and quickeneth them, even so the Son quickeneth whom he will." John v. 21.

It really seems to the writer of this, that the work here ascribed to the Father is the raising of the deceased to an immortal celestial life; also, that that claimed by the Son is the bringing of some into a state of spiritual or religious life on

earth. Of this interpretation, however, the writer is by no means tenacious. He will only say, in this place, that of whatever nature the work of the ONE or of the Other really is, the *time* of doing it is indicated by the use of *the present tense;* also, that, apart from creeds, there is no reason why the expression "raiseth up"—, properly "raiseth,"—should *not* be taken as denoting *present* or passing time.

In the verse preceding the text, we read, "The Father loveth the Son." In the verse succeeding, we *properly* read, "The Father judgeth no one." Present time is intended, no doubt, in these two;—why not, then, where it is said, (in the verse occurring between the two,) "The Father *raiseth the dead*"?[1]

The apostle Paul, in one of his Letters, tells of a "trouble" he had been having, and which had pressed upon him so overpoweringly that he had despaired even of life. He tells also of God's having delivered him "from so great a death", and of his having learned not to *trust* in himself, "but in God who raiseth the dead."[2]

In this text, *a present participle*, preceded by the article with a personal import, is applied to the raising mentioned,—a more literal translation being, "but in God, *the One raising* the dead." A few verses previous, we read of "the God of all comfort, *who comforteth* us in all our tribulation." Here, as in the text in hand, a more literal rendering would be, "*the One comforting*," &c. Yet since no person would pretend to understand this text in any other sense than that God had *all along* been comforting at least the apostle in his troubles, it must be clear that the common rendering, "who

[1] John v. 20–22. [2] 2 Cor. i. 8–10.

comforteth," is not an improper one. And it being a fact that the same construction occurs in the text where we read that God "raiseth the dead," I can not conceive that the language of the apostle was designed to teach any thing less than that even as *he* with others had been comforted from time to time, so *the dead* were being *raised* one after another.

It may perhaps be thought that the raising here mentioned belongs to this world; for the apostle goes on to tell of having been delivered from death. The writer believes, confidently, that the text in question has reference to the after-death life; yet, as with the text from John, so with this, he is not at all pertinacious concerning his view of its reference. One thing, however, he is somewhat anxious to impress upon the reader's mind — the *time* meant to be indicated in the expression "raiseth the dead," is certainly an extended present.

Query. In 2 Cor. i. 10, would not "preserved" be a much better rendering than "delivered"? — "Who preserved us from so great a death, and doth preserve: in whom we trust that HE will still preserve."

In the speech of Paul before Agrippa, the apostle adverts to the raising of the dead, in word and manner as follows, according to the Common Version:

"Why should it be thought a thing incredible with you, that God should raise the dead"? Acts xxvi. 8.

It was never disputed, perhaps, that, in this text, the apostle spoke of a raising into the immortal state. Yet its rendering in the Common Version, if right, is by no means literal. The tense in the Greek is indisputably the simple present, not an indefinite. The same verb, with the same inflec-

tion of the verb, occurs here that occurs in the text from John, "The Father raiseth up the dead." And the literal rendering of the last clause of the text from Acts is undeniably this, "that God raises the dead?"

Not now to mention the text from John concerning God's raising the dead, the fact that Paul applied the present tense to such raising, in the two texts cited from him on that subject, but especially in the latter one, seems to show, with entire clearness, that he viewed the celestial resurrection to be a process going on in present time. Had he intended an exclusively future time, it must have been perfectly easy, and natural too, for him to put the verb *egeiro* in the future *tense*, so that, in English, the latter part of the latter text would properly read, "that God *will* raise the dead?"

In the 15th chapter of 1st Corinthians, this same apostle applies the present tense to the resurrection a dozen or more of times in a direct manner, and a considerable number of times by implication. Thus,— to cite less than half the examples occurring in the chapter,— he holds forth as follows:

"How say some among you that there IS no resurrection of the dead?"

"If there BE no resurrection of the dead, then is Christ not risen."

"If the dead RISE not, then is Christ not raised."

"How ARE the dead raised up? and with what body DO they come?"

"It IS raised a spiritual body."

The circumstance that the apostle employed the present tense so many times in this one chapter, as well when setting forth the *manner* of the resurrection, as when arguing its reality, is a convincing proof that he meant to be understood as teaching that the resurrection is occurring continually.

It is a fact well worthy of observation, that

throughout the chapter in mention, whenever the apostle employs the present tense of the verb *egeiro* = "raise," he is careful to so connect it with the present tense of some other verb, or with a past tense of the same verb, and withal to put the verb in such form, as that the expression, *rightly rendered*, cannot be taken in a future sense without an obvious departure from the ordinary rules of construction. Thus, for example,

When setting forth the *manner* of the resurrection, in answer to the questions, "How are the dead raised up? and with what body do they come?, he coupled the verb "is raised" with the verb "is sown" four times in one sentence:

> "So also is the resurrection of the dead. It is sown in corruption; it is raised in incorruption: it is sown in dishonor; it is raised in glory: it is sown in weakness; it is raised in power: it is sown a natural body; it is raised a spiritual body." Verses 42—44.

Now, as figuratively applied in the above-cited passage, just what is meant by being "*sown*," is perhaps dubious. Some understand it of man's introduction into existence; others, of his departure from this mode of being, symbolized by burial. But whether it refers to his genesis, or to his exodus, or to neither, one fact is clearly manifest — the thing is being done,— the process is enacted with each individual separately,— there is a *series* of sowings, let sowing mean what it may. But the apostle uses the verb "is raised" in precisely the same manner as he does the verb is sown; — how, then, can we consistently understand him as intending to teach that the raising of all the dead is to be effected at some future time simultaneously?

Again. While arguing the *verity* of the resurrection from the fact of Christ's having been raised,

the apostle not only applies the present tense to the raising of the dead, but he associates that tense twice with the *imperfect*, and, in the original, six times with the *perfect* tense.* Thus he says, "If Christ be not risen, [rightly, "if Christ *has* not *been raised*,"] . . . . . we are found false witnesses of God; because we have testified of God that He *raised* up Christ; whom He *raised* not up if so be," &c. So when the apostle is made to say, "If there be no resurrection of the dead, then is Christ not risen," what he really says is, "If there is no resurrection of the dead, then Christ *has* not *been* raised." And the *philosophy* of this collocation of tenses is, that the present tense, when thus coupled with the past tense, does not naturally slide into a future signification. The past tense fixes it to its own proper time.

Once more. Instead of saying, "the dead rise," using the verb intransitively, as represented in the Common Version, the apostle, in the phrase so rendered, and which occurs four times, constantly puts the verb in the *passive* form, and says "are raised." (Egeirontai.) Thus, where he is made to say, "If the dead *rise* not, then is Christ not raised," what he really says is, "If the dead *are* not *raised*, then Christ has not been raised." "Rise" is no more a proper rendering here, than "rises" would be in the passage where, as we have seen, he four times uses the expression "is raised," (Egeiretai.)

The difference, as to *manner* of time, between the intransitive present and the *passive* present,—and between the passive present and the passive *perfect*,—may be stated thus: The intransitive

* In the Common Version, the *perfect* time passive of *egeiro* = "raise," is, in 1st Corinthians, 15th totally ignored.

present properly indicates present time, yet not unfrequently bears a future sense, its time being usually somewhat extended in that direction; — the *passive* present denotes present time begun back in the past, and so is very rarely, if ever, used for a future. And since the passive *perfect* indicates past time extending forward *to* present time, the character of this tense and that of the passive present differ little *except* in their manner of time, the latter being, as it were, a past present, while the former is — so to speak — a present past. Yet it is far from being a fact that either one can in all cases be properly substituted for the other.

In the light of this analysis, let us transcribe a portion of the apostle's argument. I follow the Common Version, for the most part, except in the tenses:

"Now if Christ is preached that he has been raised from the dead, how say some among you that there is no resurrection of the dead? But if there is no resurrection of the dead, then Christ has not been raised: and if Christ has not been raised, then is our preaching vain, and your faith is also vain. Yea, we are even found false witnesses of God; because we have testified of God that he raised Christ; whom he did not raise, if so be that the dead are not raised. For if the dead are not raised, then Christ has not been raised. And if Christ has not been raised," &c.

Now to say, in the language of the Common Version, "If the dead rise not, then is not Christ raised," is truly to argue a present rising of the dead; yet, from preconceived opinions, the verb "rise" may be (mis) taken in a future sense. But to say,— as the apostles actually did say, and, in substance, as many as three or four times,—"If the dead are not raised, then Christ has not been raised," is to argue unequivocally that the dead are in a raised state. They are raised, and have been, and

were; even as Christ was raised, and has been, and is.

It may be asserted here, concerning *egeiromai*, the passive form of egeiro, that, in all its variations, it is passive *only* in form, its sense not being "to be raised," but simply "to rise," or "to be risen." But to prove it true in *Scripture* usage, (I do not say, by the dicta of translators,) it must at least be shown that, in the Scriptures, *egeiro* has scarcely ever the *transitive* signification of "to raise", but nearly always the *in*transitive signification of "to rise". But the entire opposite of this is entirely true, so far at least as regards the use of the word by Paul and Peter in their writings, and — we may add — by Paul, and Peter, and others, as given by Luke in Acts. Thus the proposition that GOD "raised" *Christ*, (*egeiro* being used,) is stated six times in Acts, ten times in Paul's Epistles, and once in 1st Peter; and in all these instances *egeiro* is in the active voice, and used transitively, as is perfectly obvious. When, therefore, as in 1 Cor. 15th, the apostle puts this verb in the *passive* voice, and thus seems to say that Christ "has been raised", we may know that what he seems to say he really says; for that if God really *raised* Christ, Christ really *was* raised by HIM. So, also, if by HIS power God actually "raises" *the dead*, which, as we have seen, was actually taught, and in express terms, not only by Paul, but by the Lord Jesus Christ himself, then, through the Divine power, the dead *are* actually raised; and when not only Paul, but the Lord Jesus Christ himself, each seems to say that "the dead are raised", they say not that the dead "rise", or "are risen", but actually that "the dead are raised."

To conclude this chapter, If it was not the

doctrine of Paul that the raising of the dead occurs in present time, why did he make an objector say, "How *are* the dead raised up"? Especially, why did he also put *this* question into his mouth, "With what body DO they come? It is manifest that the *time* of the resurrection was not the point in debate between Paul and his antagonist; and that his charging him with the non-use of his intellectual powers, was not from any perceived error in him as regards the *when* of the process. If, therefore, it had been the apostle's doctrine that the resurrection of the dead is exclusively future, he would most certainly have worded the supposed questions thus: "How *will* the dead be raised? and with what body *will* they come?" (See 1 Cor. xv. 35.)

## CHAPTER XXIX.

A PRESENT OR PASSING RESURRECTION — CONCLUDED.

VIII. It has been presented as an objection against the Scripturality of a present or passing resurrection, that Paul, in one place, speaks of certain men's having erred concerning the truth, "saying, that the resurrection is past already." On this I remark that their error consisted not in holding that the resurrection was some of it past, but in holding that it *all* was. The apostle had himself said, in that same chapter, "Remember that Jesus Christ, of the seed of David, was raised from the dead." [1]

IX. An other objection is based upon the circumstance that Jesus Christ is declared, in the Scriptures, to be "the first-born from the dead". [2] The objection proceeds on the ground (, which will be left undisturbed for the present,) that the sense of the text is to the effect that Christ was the first who was raised into the immortal state; and it is hence naturally enough argued that seeing the doctrine of a present resurrection was not true before His time, it is not true now. I reply as follows:

The text contains the phrase "from the dead." But the resurrection *of* the dead, and the resurrection of some one *from* the dead, are quite two

[1] 2 Tim. ii. 8, 18. [2] Col. i. 18.

things. Rising *from* the dead supposes being as it were *set apart* from the dead in general, by the peculiarity of having such an organization as that the *riser* can be seen, heard, handled, &c., by persons in the flesh. (See Chaps. ii., iii.)

Various individuals were raised from the dead before Christ was; yet they, as also others who were raised afterward, were raised to mere mortal life. It is therefore a fact that Christ is not only the first, but is also the last, ever raised *from the dead to an immortal life.* And this fact is perfectly in harmony with the doctrine that the resurrection of each human being to immortal life takes place at or soon after the decease of such human being; also, that this has constantly been the course of events in that line ever since death entered the world. For the dead in general are not raised *from* the dead — indeed how could they be? The Scripture instructs us simply that the dead are raised, giving no intimation that they are raised from *themselves*, or that they ever will be.

The dead are raised in spiritual bodies, and so, to the mere physical sense, are imperceptible. In order, therefore, that the great fact of human immortality might be rendered in a manner *sensible*, so that persons religiously "spiritual"[1] in but a moderate degree could perceive and appreciate it, "*the man* Christ Jesus", who, as to the constitution of His nature, had "in all things" been "made like His brethren", was, in the Divine economy, *singled out* —, so to speak, — from the rest of the dead, by being caused to take on, for a time, his earthly body, in *addition* to being spiritually embodied in common with the dead in general. Viewed thus, He is clearly the Alpha and the Omega, the First and also the Last.[2]

[1] 1 Cor. ii. 15.
[2] 1 Tim. ii. 5; Heb. ii. 17; Rev. i. 11, 17; xxii. 13.

The text in question, however, seems to relate to dignity, rather than to priority. Being "the first-born" appears to have reference — not to primogeniture, but — to eminence in official station:

"Who is the beginning, the first-born from the dead, that in all things he might have the pre-eminence." Col. i. 18.

In the Psalms we read, "Also I will make him My first-born, higher than the kings of the earth." According to the genius of Hebrew poetry, the latter half of this verse shows the sense of the former; and as it is not said, *older*, or more ancient than the kings of the earth, but simply "higher", it follows that, at least in the language of the Psalmist, "first-born" is the same as "Premier", or prime minister, or first minister, which, by usage, is synonymous with the *chief* officer under the Sovereign. An allusion to this text from the Psalms seems to be made in the book of the Revelation, where we read that Christ is "the first-begotten [, rightly, "the first-born] of the dead, and the PRINCE of the kings of the earth." So Paul, in a certain place, tells us that some were to be "conformed to the image" of Christ, in order "that He might be the first-born among many brethren". (The Premier, or Chief One.) So also, through the prophet, the Lord says, "Behold I have given him for . . . . . a Leader and Commander to the people." [1] Note. In most of these texts, the idea of Regal heirship is probably also included. See Ps. ii. 7, 8, and other places.

In like manner, the text in question speaks of his having "the pre-eminence"; and the Common Version makes him to have it "in all things"; but the phrase rendered "in all things", may quite as

[1] Ps. lxxxix. 27; Rev. i. 5; Rom. viii. 29; Isa. lv. 4.

properly be rendered "over all persons." The language of the text is at least eminently calculated to set forth the fact of Christ's pre-eminent superiority. Even in the affirmation that he is "the beginning", the word so rendered, when applied to persons, and especially to those in office, properly signifies a Leader, or the one first or highest in rank. And in the phrase "from the dead", the preposition *may* import "selected from" or "chosen from" on account of excellence, and so be equivalent to "of" or "among". (See Chap. iii.) The sense of the text I then take to be that Jesus is the Leader, *the Chief One of or among those who have died*, the One having pre-eminence over all. With this view of the text, it is parallel with that one where, by a literal rendering, it is declared that "to this end Christ both died and lived, that he might have dominion over both dead and living".[1]

X. It will, however, be objected that Paul, before Agrippa, declares expressly that Moses and the prophets had predicted of Christ "that He should be the first that should rise from the dead."[2] From this text the same argument is deduced as in the previous objection; and so far as rising *from the dead* is concerned, the same remarks are applicable. But it is needful to remark further, that the text is strangely mistranslated, the common rendering here being singularly unfaithful to the Greek original.

Ει πρωτος εξ αναστασεως νεκρων

*Ei protos ex anastaseos nekron.*

In the Common Version, the above Greek phrase is rendered into English "on this wise":

*Ei*, "that;" *protos*, "the first;" *ex*, "from;"

[1] Rom. xiv. 9. [2] Acts xxvi. 23.

*anastaseos*, "he should be . . . . . that should rise;" *nekrōn*, "the dead," = "That he should be the first that should rise from the dead."

"*Anastaseos*" is simply the noun anastasis in *the genitive case;* and this mere *noun* is here made to be equivalent to *two verbs* and their nominatives — "he should be . . . . that should rise"!

The phrase "*ex anastaseos nekrōn*" occurs also in the Epistle to the Romans. (See i. 4.) In that place it is rendered thus: "by the resurrection from the dead." How different from the rendering just considered!

The *philosophy* of the above-mentioned rendering in Romans, whether correct or otherwise, I take to be as follows:

The preposition *ek* or *ex* requires the genitive case after it; and when placed before *two* nouns in the genitive, it *may* have the same force as if *duplicated*, and placed next to the latter noun also, — the latter noun being put in the genitive — not to indicate the relation expressed by "*of*" in English, but — because that case is required by *ek* or *ex*. "*Ex anastaseos nekrōn*," in that text, is taken to be equivalent to *ex anastaseos* ek *nekrōn*, literally, "out of a rising from among the dead," — which, however, would be oftener rendered, "out of the resurrection from the dead," or "from the resurrection from the dead." But at the commencement of such an expression, "*by*" is equivalent to "out of" or "from"; — the translators therefore employed that word instead of "out of" as being more elegant, and instead of "from" to prevent tautology, and so represent the apostle as saying that Jesus Christ was "declared to be the Son of God with power, . . . . . *by* the resurrection *from* the dead."

I do not say that the rendering of the Common

Version here, is the best that can be ; but I do say that the rendering in Romans is superlatively preferable to that in Acts. How could the same translators translate the same expression so very differently, especially since it so obviously has the same reference in the one place as it has in the other!

Let the style of translation here in Romans be applied to the texts now in hand from Acts, and the passage will read substantially thus:

"That the Christ should suffer, in order that, by a rising from among the dead, he might first clearly announce light to the people and to the Gentiles."

## CHAPTER XXX.

### THE MANNER OF THE RESURRECTION.

"So also is the resurrection of the dead. It is sown in corruption; it is raised in incorruption: it is sown in dishonor; it is raised in glory: it is sown in weakness; it is raised in power: it is sown a natural body; it is raised a spiritual body." 1 Cor. xv. 42—44.

What is *it* that is here said to be sown and raised?

Just what it is, is not said by the apostle — and who else now can say? The subjects of those verbs he leaves to be supplied from the language he had used,— and only says, "is sown," "is raised," not prefixing even a pronoun. In the rendering of such constructions, however, which, by the way, are rather common in Greek, some pronoun is commonly taken to be understood; and accordingly the word "*it*" appears here, that is, in the Common Version. But, in this text, the insertion of "it" as a nominative to the verbs following, changes uncertain sense into sheer nonsense; since "it" seems to stand for the noun or phrase next preceding it, which makes the affirmation seem to be that "*the resurrection of the dead*" is that which is sown and raised: "So also is the resurrection of the dead. *It* is sown," &c.

Some supply the word "*body*"; as, "The body

is sown in corruption ; it is raised in incorruption :" &c. This represents the apostle as teaching that the body which is sown is the same one that is raised, which certainly was not his doctrine ; for he declares expressly, in reference to that with which he compares the unexpressed thing, " Thou sowest *not* that body that shall be ;" or more properly, " the body which will spring into being."

Others think the word "*man*" should be supplied ; as, " Man is sown . . . . . he is raised," &c. This makes the apostle affirm of man — what it seems very unlikely he meant to affirm of man — that he is a " *body*," or a mere organization ; as "Man is sown a natural body; he is raised a spiritual body."

The text is confessedly difficult of explication. It professes to set forth the *manner* of " the resurrection of the dead," in answer to the questions, " How are the dead raised ? and with what body do they come ? " But it seems, at first view, unfortunate that in the passage of which the text forms a part, there are frequent *ellipses* of nouns and verbs ; the neuter pronoun is employed in an *extra*-indeterminate manner ; a lengthy *parenthesis*, consisting of many particulars, is thrown in between the first and last part of the answer ; an *unusual* use of some important terms seems to be made ; and in the text itself, occurs a rather an apparent *solecism* * in language. It is perhaps possible, however, that by paying very particular attention both to the drift of the apostle's ideas, and to the construction of his sentences, his meaning may be unfolded truly and fully. I attempt its unfoldment in this chapter. And

1. Paul makes his questioner not respectfully to *ask* the questions, as would an honest, sincere in-

* See last paragraph of this chapter.

quirer, but disrespectfully to "*say*" them, as would a captious, sneering objector: "But some one will say," &c. Hence his exclamation, "Foolish one! that which thou sowest," &c.

2. Having such a questioner in his mind, he therefore, in reply to the first question, "How are the dead raised?" does not forthwith declare the *manner* of the operation, but shows simply that the thing is not incredible. "That which thou sowest"—, says he,—"is not quickened, if it does not die." He thus calls attention to the natural fact that if a kernel of grain germinates, its germ shoots forth into vegetable life, while the kernel itself dies, that is, loses its seminal life, and so perishes. By a very familiar example, then, he showed that life may and often does succeed death.

3. Also, in reply to the second question, "With what body," &c., he does not, at first, treat it as an inquiry, and so immediately mention the kind of body with which the dead come; but he replies as if to the naked *assumption* that there is no bodily organization except this fleshly one, and hence that when this becomes defunct, the spirit must be bodiless, as a matter of course. Says he, "Thou sowest not the body which will spring into being; but . . . . . God gives a body," &c. In this he shows that when, in the germination of a seed, life succeeds death, a new body also succeeds the old.

4. In these replies, the apostle also recognizes the fact that though a seed is in a manner *alive*, as of course it must be in order to die, its life is of a lower grade than that of the plant which springs from it, the latter possessing vegetable life, while the former has but seminal life. He seems quite aware, also, that the *organization* of a seed is of a less advanced grade than is that of a plant; or, in

other words, that both the life and the organization of a plant are of a *higher* grade than are those of the seed from which it sprung. Says he, "Thou sowest not the body which will spring into being;" —that is, the future plant; —"but thou sowest a mere kernel; perhaps of wheat . . . . . ; and God gives to the germ within it a body, according as he willed; also, to each of the seeds He thus gives its proper body." (See Chap. xxxvi of this work.)

5. He next adds three verses of the nature of a parenthesis, setting forth that what we call *flesh* is not all of the same specific quality — "one kind of flesh of men, an other flesh of beasts," &c.; — that there are bodies in the *sky* as well as on earth — "celestial bodies, and bodies terrestrial;"— that the celestial and terrestrial bodies have each their own *glory* or splendor — "the glory of the celestial is one; and the glory of the terrestrial is an other;" — that the different orders of celestial bodies have different glories, or *degrees* of splendor — "one glory of the Sun, and an other glory of the Moon," &c.; — also, that celestial bodies of the *same* order (as the stars) have not all the same splendor — "one star differeth from an other star in glory."

6. He now applies to the subject his simile of grain-sowing with some of its results, in which process is committed to the earth — not a growing plant, but — an inactive kernel, whose *germ*, however, becomes a plant, while the kernel itself perishes. And it is highly important to be observed, here, that the affirmation, "so also is the resurrection of the dead," is not, grammatically, coupled with the immediately preceding affirmation, "one star differeth from an other star in glory;" (their union giving rise to the not remarkably luminous

proposition, "as the stars differ in glory, so also is the resurrection;) but the words "so also," &c., are actually connected, in grammatical construction, with what is said four verses previous. I quote, passing over the three parenthetical verses, and adopting a rendering very nearly literal, and containing no supplied words:

"But some one will say, 'How are the dead raised? and with what body did they come?' Foolish one! that which thou sowest is not quickened, if it does not die. And that which thou sowest, thou sowest not the body which will spring into being; but a mere kernel; perhaps of wheat, or of some one of the others; and God gives a body to it, according as He willed; also, to each of the seeds, its proper body." * * * *

"In such manner, also, the raising of the dead: is sown in corruptibility; is raised in incorruptibility: is sown in dishonor; is raised in glory: is sown in weakness; is raised in power: is sown an animal body; is raised a spiritual body." (See Chap. xxxvi.)

The *drift* of the above, to my poor perception, is to the following purport: Grain is sown; the germ of the kernel sprouts; the body of the kernel dies; the life-principle of the germ draws around itself a new and different organism; and all this in accordance with the original will of God: "in such manner, also, the raising of the dead," &c. — which is to say that the circumstances attendant on our transition from this to an other mode of being, are, in certain respects, analogous to those connected with the springing of a plant from a seed.

7. From the foregoing considerations, several things seem well-nigh certain: as,

*First.* In the latter paragraph of the passage just cited, the proper nominative of the verb "is sown," and the proper nominative of the verb "is raised," can not be the same, but must be different; for the apostle had said of the *grain* or kernel liter-

literally sown, with which he compares a something metaphorically sown, "Thou sowest *not* the body which will spring into being."

*Second.* The thing metaphorically sown is evidently this corruptible and mortal body, answering to the kernel which the objector sowed literally.

*Third.* In a literal sense, to be "sown," supposes being committed to the earth; yet as affirmed metaphorically of the human body, though an allusion may be had to interment, the important idea is clearly this, that the body is *dead.* Yet a fact of very great significance is manifestly *implied* in this use of the verb "to sow,"—namely, that the earthly body, while possessed of its life, incloses a germ of a higher mode of life.

*Fourth.* In the passage under consideration, that which is *raised*, whatever it really is, answers to that in a kernel represented by "it," (or by a something *within* the it,) in the text where the apostle says that "God gives a body to it." He had said, "That which thou sowest is not quickened, if it does not die;" but the "it" which dies, and the "it" which takes a new body, are obviously two things. What are these two things, if the one is not the kernel, and the other its vegetative germ? * the former dying, the latter springing up, and becoming unfolded into a vegetable?

*Fifth.* Since, in the passage in hand, the process

* "Vegetative germ." Some have dreamed of a *principle*—or something else—appertaining to each plant, which principle (, or whatever else it may be called,) is analogous to the *spirit* in man. I do not take it upon me to say that there is no such thing as "a plant-spirit;" nor do I affirm that Paul did not recognize its existence, if it has any;—what I say in relation to it, is, that, *to me*, his language in this place conveys not even an *allusion* to such an entity. But I do understand him as recognizing in a seed the existence of a something which I have called a "vegetative germ," which germ may be considered as a rudimental plant—a plant as it were in embryo. *To* this God gives a body; that is, He causes it to grow up into a visible, tangible organism.

of being "raised" is compared to the springing of a plant from a seed, or —, which is the same thing, — to its germ's receiving a vegetable body, it is apparent that the verb "is raised" has, here, the actual sense of "is unfolded," or "is unfolded into;" "is developed," or "is developed into." And it may be worthy of note in this connection, that the word here rendered "is raised," *primarily* imports "is awakened," or "is aroused," — the figure thus being that the rudimentary plant, or second body, is in a manner *dormant* within the kernel, or first body, until after this body is "sown."

*Sixth.* As has been said, the thing metaphorically *sown* is plainly "the earthly body." This expression might therefore be properly supplied as a *nominative* to the verb "is sown." But a proper nominative to the verb "is raised" can not so readily be supplied; since the real subject of the affirmation has no specific *name* in even the modern languages, much less in the ancient. This fact, so far as the Greek is concerned, was perhaps the reason why Paul left *both* the verbs in mention without any nominatives expressed. Had he but said, at the beginning of the sentence, "*To soma* speiretai," — *The body* is sown, the sense of the next verb, (egeiretai,) now simply "is raised," would clearly have been "*it* is raised;" and, though he had left all the rest of the nominatives, as now, wholly blank, the word "it" would have been understood before each repetition of each of the two verbs throughout the sentence; and he thus unquestionably would have taught, whether he intended it or not, — and he clearly did not, — that the body which is raised is the identical one that is sown.

*Seventh.* That entity which the apostle would

here have us understand is awaked—roused — raised — developed — or unfolded in the anastasis of a deceased person, is that particular portion of man's essential nature (, unnamed, and, for the most part, ignored,) from which, on the death of the earthly organism, or "animal body," arises, by the contrivance and appointment of God, that super-earthly organism denominated "a spiritual body," through connection with which body each of the so-called dead is, in the scriptural sense, incorruptible and immortal.

Note. In the absence of any specific name, the entity in mention may be styled a "spiritual germ," or the germ of a spiritual organization.

The following rather paraphrastical rendering of the passage placed at the head of this chapter, and a pretty free translation of the same which follows that, present, in connection, a rather brief and pretty fair *synopsis* of my views as to the subject indicated by the title of this chapter:

"In such manner, also, is brought about the raising of the dead: that pertaining to us which is symbolized by a kernel of grain, is sown in corruptibility; that within us answering to what becomes unfolded into a plant, is raised in incorruptibility: the former of these is sown in dishonor; the latter is raised in glory: the former is sown in weakness; the latter is raised in power: the former is sown an animal body; the latter is raised a spiritual body." (See Chap. xxxvi., where the supplied words in the above are put in brackets.)

Or,—

"In a manner somewhat analogous to the above-mentioned circumstances, is also effected the passing of human beings from the present into the future mode of existence:

The earthly body loses its vitality,
and perishes in corruptibility;
the spiritual germ within it survives, and
becomes unfolded in incorruptibility;

The earthly body loses its vitality,
and perishes in dishonor;
the spiritual germ within it, survives, and
becomes unfolded in glory:

> The earthly body loses its vitality,
> and perishes in weakness;
> the spiritual germ within it, survives, and
> becomes unfolded in power:
>
> The earthly body loses its vitality,
> and perishes an animal body;
> the spiritual germ within it, survives, and
> becomes unfolded into a spiritual body."

Though death is commonly affirmed of *persons*, as where Paul says, "In Adam all die," it is, in at least one instance, affirmed of the human *body*, as when James says, "The body without the spirit is dead." (Chap. ii. 26.) So in the passage above in hand, though the topic under consideration is verbally the resurrection of *the dead*, or the raising of dead persons, the apostle, in giving the *philosophy* of such resurrection, teaches a raising — not of persons, (that is, not verbally so,) but — of something *appertaining* to a person. He usually mentions "the dead," and affirms that they "are raised;" (persons and plural number;) but, in this passage, he says, "*is* raised," using an inflection of the verb agreeing with some subject in the singular, which subject or nominative is manifestly neither man, nor the spirit of man, for it is plainly declared to be "raised a spiritual *body*." And his thus saying, in amount, "So is the raising of dead persons," and then adding, "*It is* raised," &c., instead of "*They are* raised," is what constitutes the apparent "*solecism*," or example of "false syntax," alluded to in the fore part of this chapter.

## CHAPTER XXXI.

### THE PRIMITIVE GOSPEL.

The apostle Paul, in his first letter to the Christians at Corinth, takes up the subject of the resurrection, and treats it at considerable length. And it is a noteworthy fact that he prefaces his remarks with what, to the persons addressed, was fully equivalent to an extended account of Christ, especially as to His death, burial, resurrection, and subsequent appearings to his friends. Of course, the apostle does not put all this into a few brief paragraphs; but he expressly and specially reminds the brethren that in his first discourses to them while with them, the topics presented were the great facts of the Gospel History, — so called, — which facts —, he also reminds them, — they, as Christians, had received and believed. He lets them know, moreover, that, in similar circumstances, the other apostles, as well as himself, followed the same style of sermonizing at that present time:

"I declare to you the Gospel which I preached to you, which also ye have received.

"I delivered to you, first of all, . . . . . that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures; and that he was buried, and that he rose again the third day . . . . . ; and that he was seen of Cephas, then of the twelve; after that . . . . . of above five hundred brethren at once; . . . . . after that, . . . . . of James, then of all the apostles.

"And last of all he was seen of me also.

"So we preach, and so ye believed." 1 Cor. xv. 1–11.

The Corinthian brethren, by thus recalling, as they could scarcely avoid doing, the particular topics presented orally by Paul in his first sermons among them, must have been much better prepared than they otherwise could have been, to appreciate the propriety and force of his written argument for the actual resurrection of the dead, based upon the well-attested and, in their case, admitted fact of the actual resurrection of Christ.

The writer of this work is strongly impressed with the conviction that something akin to apostolical preaching might not be altogether unprofitable in this the 19th century. Were such preaching at all common, the writing of this and of the three following chapters would, in his estimation, be far less needful than it is at present. He writes them with the hope that by the perusal of them, in connection with the one immediately following them, the great gospel-divulged Fact of the existence of a resurrection world, where the human departed are living in a spiritual mode of being, may the more clearly and vividly be perceived by his readers to *be* a fact — an existing reality — a present verity — as really and as verily such as is this earthly state.

It is by no means probable that in tracing that part of the Gospel History which is the subject of the three following chapters, the writer will be so fortunate as to be altogether successful in the attempt to give the true order of events. From the fragmentary accounts left to us by those of the early evangelists who reduced to writing their respective Gospels, or Memoirs of the Saviour, it is no easy matter, if indeed the thing is at all possible, to compile a continuous, coherent, consistent, not to say complete narrative of the Life of Christ, or even of any considerable portion thereof.

The object of the first gospel preachers, which was "to preach Jesus Christ," could be very well accomplished without their taking the time and pains necessary to hunt up and collate an amount of testimony concerning our Lord's sayings, doings, and sufferings, that would enable them compendiously to present the whole in the exact order in which the events occurred. And *later*, when it became desirable to *write* the Gospel History, the requisite collection and comparison of testimony had come to be impossible, or well-nigh so, from the scattered condition of the disciples, and from other circumstances; and so the work seems not to have been attempted — at least to any considerable extent. Accordingly, in various passages where the writers may seem, at first view, to be professedly giving a history of events in the order of their occurrence, it will be found, on an attentive examination, that it is only each particular *group* of events in which the order of events is even attempted to be given; and that the several groups are presented in the order best suited to the narrator's plan of writing, which, in some instances, almost seems to have been the order in which those groups happened to come into mind.

In Paul's *synopsis* of his Gospel, as he had preached it to the Corinthians, I conceive that, for the most part, where he seems to be declaring the order of Christ's *appearings* after His resurrection, he is simply recounting the order in which himself had "*delivered*" certain separate accounts of such appearings.

"I delivered to you, first of all," says he, "that Christ died, ..... was buried, ..... rose, .... was seen by Cephas," (which is to say, Peter,) &c. Now when he goes on further to say, "After

that, he was seen" &c., I can not but consider his meaning to be, "After that, *I delivered that* he was seen by above five hundred . . . . . After that, *that* he was seen by James," &c. "And last of all, *that* he was seen by me." (See Chap. xxxvi.)

It is manifest also, that when he says, "the twelve", he simply means, *the apostles;* and he seems to have explained to the brethren that not all of even the eleven apostles were present at the particular interview mentioned; for he afterward uses the expression, "*all* the apostles," that is, the eleven.

In the accounts which the different evangelists give of the announcements of Christ's resurrection to the female disciples, at his tomb, on Sunday morning, there are several *apparent* discrepancies, not necessary to be mentioned here; and, in regard to the movements of Mary Magdalene, there is one real one. Yet in the narrative of Mark, who in writing his Gospel is supposed to have sometimes conferred with Peter, there occurs a statement in harmony with the narrative of John, who, as also Peter, was personally cognizant of her movements on that morning; and by means of these, we are enabled not only to get at the actual facts of the case, but also to fully account for the said discrepancy, showing that it arose in the most natural manner, and thus that its existence detracts nothing from the credibility of the evangelists, it clearly evincing the entire absence of any collusion among them. Thus,

Mark makes an isolated statement that Christ "appeared first to Mary Magdalene", and that "she went and told those who had been with him." John narrates, at some length, that *she* went to the sepulcher or tomb very early, and seeing it open, ran and told Peter and him that Christ's body had been taken away; that Peter and he visited the

tomb, found that His body was gone, and then returned home; that she came back, saw two angels, and then saw Jesus; that Jesus gave her a message to His "brethren"; and that she accordingly went and told what she had seen and heard to "the disciples" in general.

According to Matthew, Mary Magdalene and "the other Mary" went to the tomb together; and an "angel of the Lord" announced to them Christ's resurrection, and directed them to go and tell his disciples of it. According to Mark, this announcement and message were received not only by Mary Magdalene and an other Mary, but also by a woman named Salome; and he makes mention of other "women," and of "many other women," but does not explicitly *say* that more than *three* visited the tomb. Luke relates that the women "who followed" Christ "from Galilee," "and certain others with them," visited the tomb, received a like announcement from *two* angels, and then returning, "told all these things to the eleven, and to all the rest." And seeing that he immediately adds, "It was Mary Magdalene, and Joanna, and Mary the mother of James, and other women that were with them, who told these things to the apostles," he therefore *seems* to say that all the women he had mentioned,— perhaps several tombfuls of them,— were within the tomb on the same occasion, and all at the same time; and that they all saw the two angels standing among them, &c.

The only *real* discrepancy which I perceive in all this, or at least the only one of any importance, is between the statement of John, that Mary Magdelene went to the sepulcher, but immediately returned to inform Peter and him that the body of Jesus had been taken away,— and the concurrent

statements of Matthew and Mark, that she went into the sepulcher accompanied by one or more, and there shared in the angelic communication as to Jesus' resurrection. But seeing she had *agreed* to be at the tomb on that morning, along with the other women; and seeing she actually did arrive there, in company with at least "the other Mary;" and seeing she became conspicuous among those who spread the news of His having arisen; it is easy to see that the mistake of the first two evangelists was a perfectly natural one, and that it does by no means invalidate the testimony for His actual resurrection.

In this and the three following chapters, references to Scripture texts are for the most part omitted. Every reader ought to be familiar with the Scripture accounts of our Lord's apprehension, examination, crucifixion, resurrection, and ascension; and every Bible reader is presumed to know that those accounts are to be found mostly in the closing portions of the four Gospels, the first chapter of Acts, and the beginning of 1st Cor. 15th. And will my reader read over those accounts in connection with this and the three chapters following?

## CHAPTER XXXII.

### OUR LORD'S CRUCIFIXION,

#### WITH VARIOUS PRELIMINARY AND ATTENDANT EVENTS.

JESUS is in Bethany, near Jerusalem. The feast of the Passover is approaching. On Sunday morning, the first day of Passover week, he rides into Jerusalem in the style of the first kings of Israel, and an immense assemblage of people, most of whom have come out from the city on purpose to meet him, hail "the Prophet of Galilee" as the son of David, and King of Israel, and some of them even spread their *clothes* upon the ground before Him. It is a proud day for those who believe in him; since they are entirely confiduet that He is now about to ascend the throne of David, and thus to free their nation from Roman dominion, if not to make Judea the mistress of the world.

* * * It is Thursday. Though on His entrance into the city, four days ago, he took it upon him to correct sundry abuses in regard to traffic within the temple; though every day since then he has "taught openly" therein; though he has held discussions with the Sadducees and others, putting them all to silence; yea, though he has unveiled the hypocrisy, and of course inflamed the enmity of the ultra religionists of that

age; yet the great Sanhedrim, or chief Council of the nation, which long ago determined upon his apprehension, have not dared attempt arresting him publicly; for "the people" are on his side, and from morn to night, have been crowding around him, to listen to his spirit-stirring words. In this posture of affairs, "Judas, one of the twelve," from apparently a complication of motives, agrees, for a consideration, to conduct them to the place of our Lord's evening retirement, and point Him out to them by night.

It is Thursday evening. For the last few hours, what indescribable emotions have stirred his mighty yet sensitive mind! The catastrophe of his mortal career, now so near at hand, is seen by him, in at least its main particulars, with terrible distinctness. Hence in eating the Passover with the twelve, he has instructed them thereafter to regard the broken bread and flowing wine as emblems of his body marred and his blood spilled in the work of human redemption. He has announced that one of them is about to betray Him. Judas having gone out, He has told the eleven that they will *all* falter in his cause that very night; and Peter, that before another morning, *he* will even *deny* being His disciple. He has discoursed at some length about going away from them, and of the Father's sending them another Comforter or Helper. He has prayed with them, and for them,— for all who should thereafter believe on him, and for the entire world.

Taking with him only Peter, James, and John, he retires to the garden of Gethsemane. Oh the depth and intensity of feeling with which he now prays! Can not the abuse, and ridicule, and shame, and extreme tortures, just awaiting him, be by some proper means averted? Must he passive-

ly submit, even to death, without one attempt to shun such a fate? "O my Father"! — are his words — "if it is possible, let this cup pass from me."

An angel appears and strengthens him. The three witnessing disciples sink into a state of drowsiness. Evidently craving human sympathy, Jesus arouses them again, and again beseeching them to watch with him. He continues praying. He prays more and more fervently, till, in an agony of earnestness, he *sweats* as it were great drops of blood. A calm succeeds. He concludes his devotions with, "O my Father, not as I will, but as Thou wilt." "If this cup may not pass from me, ..... Thy will be done."

A band of armed men approaches, led on by Judas, who points out our Lord as agreed on. Jesus goes quietly forth to meet them, and asks whom they are in quest of. On their pronouncing His name, he calmly replies, "I am he." Backward, back, back, they recede, as if pushed by invisible hands, till, stumbling, they fall to the ground. Advancing again, and the same question being put, and the same answer returned, "if ye seek *me*,"— said he,—"let these go their way," alluding to his apostles. They flee; but Peter does not until after he has made a most determined assault. Jesus is taken, bound, and led away.

After some little delay, he is brought before the Council; but being charged with no capital offense, the high-priest, as president of the Council, questions him concerning His teachings, &c., with the hope —, it would seem,— of His letting fall something upon which such a charge might be founded. Jesus remonstrates against that manner of proceeding, and suggests that the proper course would be to call on those who had heard him.

For this He is struck by one of the officers in presence of the Court.

Witnesses are at length found to testify against him; but no two are able to agree as to what He has said that should render him deserving of death. The high-priest finally adjures him by the living God, to tell them whether he is really the Christ, the Son of God; and on His *admitting* that fact, and declaring also that they shall yet see him at the right hand of God, he is pronounced guilty of blasphemy, and thus deserving of death by stoning. (Lev. xxiv. 16.)

The soldiers have now full liberty to abuse him, by way of pastime, throughout the rest of the night. They accordingly spit in his face, — administer brisk blows with the flat hand upon his ears or temples, — buffet him with the fists, or violently push him this way and that, — he is blindfolded, then repeatedly struck and called on, as the Christ, to exercise his prophetic powers in telling who struck him, &c. In the morning early, ("the chief priests, and elders, and scribes, and the whole council," having previously held a consultation,) he is again bound, and, for the purpose principally, as appears, of having him suffer a more painful and shameful death than the Council have the legal power to inflict, is delivered over to Pilate, the Roman governor of Judea, on a charge of *treason* for professing to be the Christ in the sense of a king.

Pilate soon perceives our Lord's innocence as to this, learning from Him that his kingdom is not a worldly one. But he dares not take an independent, honest course, and so set Him at liberty, and, if necessary, *protect* him against those whose enmity is so apparent; he therefore tries, by various expedients, to get rid of condemning him,

and yet not displease the Jews. He twice urges them, and the last time with much earnestness, to receive Jesus back, and deal with him according to their law. Their reply, the first time, when Pilate does not dispute our Lord's guilt, is to the effect that they can not lawfully punish treason, not having the legal right to inflict death in the manner proper to that offense. On the second occasion, when he strongly declares our Lord's innocence, they assure him, in substance, that they are not asking him to condemn an innocent person; for that if he is not guilty of treason, he deserves to die, according to their law, for professing to be the Son of God. This last excites Pilate's religious fears; and the more as his *wife* has just sent to him, entreating him to have nothing to do with "that just man", for she has just been greatly troubled because of him, in a dream. Learning that Jesus is from Galilee, he sends him to Herod, the ruler of that region, he being then in the city. The Jews accuse Him before Herod; Jesus makes no answer to Herod's questionings; Herod treats the whole matter with levity, ridicules both Him and his pretensions as set forth by his accusers, causes him to be arrayed in a mock robe of royalty, and soon sends him back to Pilate.

Pilate had proposed to release Jesus to the Jews on the score of granting a favor to the nation at that feast, as he had been wont to do. They had refused to accept him, and had even demanded in his stead the release of one "Barabbas", a noted robber, who had also been guilty of insurrection and murder. After our Lord's return from Herod, Pilate again proposes to release him, adverting to the fact that Herod had found no fault in him any more than himself had, and offering to have him

publicly scourged for their gratification. He is answered by tumultuous shouts, "Not this man, but Barabbas." On his asking, "What then shall I do with Jesus?", they respond, "Let him be crucified." To his remonstrance, "Why? what evil hath he done?" the same response comes loud and long, "Let him be crucified."

Pilate now causes him to be scourged or whipped. This, at the hands of coarse, athletic, brutal, hardened men, in the midst of an intense popular excitement against Him, is, of course, no light infliction. He is then reärrayed in the regal purple; a *crown* of some prickly plant is prepared, and is set upon his head; a reed, or small stick, as an ensign of royalty, is placed in his right hand. With mimic gravity and reverence, the soldiers kneel before him, pronouncing, in measured accents, the salutation, "Hail king of the Jews!"; then scrambling up in the most disrespectful manner, they spit in his face, or snatch the reed-sceptre from his hand, and strike him upon the head.

This sport being ended, Pilate again attempts to save him. He exhibits Him to them robed and crowned, reiterates His undoubted innocence, and talks as if confident of their consenting to His release. He is answered by uproarious shouts from the people, who, "persuaded" and led on by the priests and others, loudly and clamorously vociferate, "Away with him! Crucify him! Crucify him." Pilate still talks as if determined to release him; but on its being said to him that by so doing he would show himself to be inimical to Cæsar, he yields, as if from fear that a complaint may be made against him to the Emperor; he washes his hands in the presence of the multitude, declaring himself innocent in regard to Jesus' death, and immediately issues orders for His crucifixion.

From the common hall of the governor's house they "led him away to crucify him"; and He "went forth bearing his cross" — carrying it on his shoulder according to custom. Yet "*as* they led [*or* were leading] him away, they laid hold upon one Simon, a Cyrenian", and "compelled" *him* to carry it.

Arrived at the place selected, the cross —, consisting of a post with a small beam fastened across it, — is laid in a convenient position on the ground; four of the soldiers strip Jesus, and stretch him out, and hold him down upon the post or "tree" part of the cross; his arms are extended, and large nails are driven through his hands into the cross piece, and through his feet into the tree; the structure is reared on end, and its foot placed in a hole dug for the purpose; the earth is filled in and tightened around it; and the crucified is guarded by the band till life is extinct. Two thieves are crucified with him. Jesus prays for his crucifiers, "Father forgive them; for they know not what they do".

It is a public execution, and is witnessed by persons from all parts of the country, who are in Jerusalem at the feast of the Passover. Mary, the soul-stricken * *mother* of Jesus, Mary Magdalene also, and two other women, with John, the beloved disciple, are allowed to be within the ring of soldiers, near the cross; his enemies —, the rulers, the elders, the chief priests, and scribes, — stand next outside the soldiery, or mingled with them; the great mass of the people next; and among them his friends and adherents in general; — these last, especially the women, are overwhelmed with grief, weeping and bewailing his unexpected and sorrowful fate; while the rulers, the elders, &c.,

* See Luke ii. 35.

echoed by some of the people, taunt and insult him in the midst of his agonies. "Save thyself," say they. "If thou art the Son of God, come down from the cross." "Let Christ, the king of Israel, descend now from the cross, that we may see and believe." "Let him now come down from the cross, and we will believe him." Then, with a practical sneer, and a triumphant toss of the head, "He saved others; himself he can not save". In the midst of all this, Jesus calmly and affectionately commends his mother to the care of John.

He was placed upon the cross perhaps between 9 and 10 A. M., — our time, — on Friday of the week. He released his spirit* at a little past 3 P. M.

During the last three hours of His sufferings, an unusual obscuration of the sun's light occurred all over that region; and a little before his spirit's departure, he gave utterance, in a loud voice, to the commencing words of the 22d Psalm in the original Hebrew. The ground in the vicinity *shakes*, as if in sympathy with the sufferer; the veil of the temple is rent in two by an invisible force; and other phenomena evince the propriety of the exclamations subsequently uttered by the Centurion and some of his soldiers, "Certainly this was a righteous man" — "Truly this was the Son of God."

Just before his exit, he makes mention of being thirsty. Instead of giving him water, a sponge is dipped in vinegar, and reached up to his mouth on the end of a stick. This being done, he cries out once more with a loud voice, exclaiming, "It is

* Matthew tells us that our Lord "released his spirit." The expression of John is that he "surrendered his spirit." Luke informs us that Jesus said, "Father, into thy hands I commit my spirit;" and that having said thus, "he expired". Mark says simply that "he expired."

finished;" then calmly ejaculating, "Father, into thy hands I commit my spirit," he bows his head, and expires. The Centurion utters his convictions as stated; and the people generally, struck with a sudden and painful convincement, smite their breasts and depart from the scene.

The Sabbath, which commenced at sunset, is now near at hand, and the Jews have requested of Pilate, that the deaths of the malefactors may be hastened, so that their bodies can be taken from the crosses before the arrival of the Sabbath hour. Accordingly, with suitable implements, wielded by strong arms, swift and heavy blows are applied to the *legs* of the two thieves, breaking and crushing the bones, and of course bruising and mashing the flesh, thus causing an amount of pain almost certain —, after five or six hours of crucifixional suffering, — to produce death in a very short time.

Jesus being already dead, the breaking of *his* legs is omitted. One of the soldiers, however, *stabs* the yet warm corpse in its side with a spear, and blood and water issue therefrom, * — thus rendering it perfectly demonstrable, without actual inspection, — taking *position* into the account, — that the region of the *heart* was penetrated by the spear — a wound which undeniably would have produced death if he had not been dead before.

Joseph, a rich citizen, now goes to the governor, and asks the body of Jesus for interment. Pilate wonders if he is so soon dead; but learning from the Centurion that He has been dead some little time, he grants the request.

The body is taken from the cross, hastily prepared for burial, and placed within a new sepulchre

* John relates this, and affirms it as a thing which he positively saw and knew; and he appears also to have been aware of the *value* of the fact. John xix. 34, 35.

or tomb, near by, hewn out in the side of a ledge of rocks, in a garden belonging to Joseph. Joseph is assisted by Nicodemus. A large stone, forming the door, is rolled to its place; and his friends depart — all that they have hitherto hoped from him being, as it were, buried with him. Several of the female disciples witness his entombment.

Subsequently, and without the knowledge of His friends, — excepting perhaps Joseph, — "the chief priests and Pharisees," with consent of the governor, cause a *seal* to be placed upon the doorway and stone in such a manner that the stone can not be removed without detection; and a *guard*, of disciplined soldiers, is set to watch the tomb till after the third day. His enemies remember — what his friends seem to have forgotten — that Jesus predicted he would *rise* on the third day; so they take these timely precautions "lest" —, say they, — "his disciples come by night, and steal him away, and say to the people, "He is risen from the dead."

The Sabbath eve and the Sabbath night, succeeded by the Sabbath morn and the Sabbath day, have now entirely passed. The hopes of the disciples in regard to their late Master, are crushed, scattered, destroyed. He is dead, entombed, gone. That he is about to appear in life again, revealing an other mode of being, enters not into their thoughts.

## CHAPTER XXXIII.

### OUR SAVIOUR'S RESURRECTION AND HIS APPEARINGS TO HIS DISCIPLES.

THE morn of Sunday is approaching. A considerable number of the female disciples, living or lodging at various places in the city and its suburbs, have agreed to meet at the tomb of Christ early in the morning, and bestow upon his body the customary anointings, which want of time before the Sabbath had prevented being done on Friday.

The morn is nigh. The women are waiting the dawn to start on their appointed visit to the tomb. They seem to know nothing of any guard having been set there; but they have some anxiety as to how the ponderous stone *door* is to be removed.

It is daybreak. An angel descends into the midst of the guard, advances to the entrance of the tomb, rolls back the huge stone from the door, and seats himself upon it. Seen in twilight, his face is like lightning, and his clothing as white as is snow. The ground in the vicinity is shaken; the soldiers quake with fear, and are paralyzed at his presence; the angel soon disappears as if having entered the tomb; the guards hastily disperse.

The corpse is released from its envelopments, and becomes resuscitated, the spirit of Jesus re-

suming the inhabitancy of His earthly body, though invested with a spiritual body also.

Mary Magdalene and another Mary presently enter the garden, and approach near enough to the tomb to perceive that the stone has been removed from its doorway. Inferring from this that His body had been taken away, Mary Magdalene sets off immediately to communicate the supposed fact to Peter and John, whose lodgings are at no great distance.

Just then several other women arrive, among whom is one named Salome,—and are much surprised to find that the stone has been rolled away. They and "the other Mary" enter the tomb. An angel informs them that Jesus has arisen as He said he should. He bids them observe where the body of Jesus has lain, and directs them to announce His resurrection to the disciples, and to tell them that Jesus will meet them in Galilee as He promised to do. The women start off with this errand and soon separate into two companies, the Mary mentioned being in one company, and Salome in the other. Of Salome and those with her, it is said not only that they "fled from the sepulchre", and "were afraid"; but also that "they trembled, and were amazed: neither said they anything to any one"; that is, on their way. Of Mary and her company, it is stated that "they departed from the sepulchre with fear and great joy; and did run to bring his disciples word".

In the meantime, Mary Magdalene having informed Peter and John that the body of Jesus has probably been removed, the two apostles run hastily to the tomb. Entering, and finding only the linen in which the body was wrapped, they adopt her conclusion, and depart homeward.

Mary Magdalene now arrives again at the tomb.

For a few moments she stands weeping at its low entrance; then stooping, she looks within, and sees *two* angels, but does not perceive them to be such. They ask her the cause of her grief. She tells them it is that her Lord has been removed from the sepulchre, and she knows not where He has been laid. She then turns herself about impulsively, as though by some sudden attraction, or as if her eyes would inquire his whereabouts, when lo! HE is standing near her, though, for obvious reasons, she has no thought of its being her beloved and lamented Master. He too asks why she weeps, and also whom she seeks. Supposing him to be the keeper of the garden, who, of course, must be aware that a corpse had been placed in the tomb on the Friday previous, she does not give a direct answer, but offers to take charge of the body, if he has removed it, provided he will inform her where he has put it. Jesus pronounces her name in the thrilling tones of His well-known voice. She instantly recognizes him, utters the single word "Rabboni",—the name for religious Master or Teacher,—and makes a movement as if to embrace him. He directs her not to wait to even *touch* him,—for that He does not ascend to the Father just yet,—but to go immediately to the apostles, and inform them not merely that He has arisen, but also that He is soon to enter upon a heavenly life. She departs at once.

The other Mary and Salome, with their companions, have now separated into two companies; and Jesus shows himself to Mary and those with her, who, overcome by their emotion, sink to the ground before him, and embrace his feet. Salome and her companions do *not* see him.

In the meantime, and just subsequently to the

second departure of Mary Magdalene from the tomb, an other company of women arrive, among whom is Joanna, the wife of Herod's steward. These also unexpectedly find the stone door rolled away; they enter, and, *not* finding His body, are much perplexed. Suddenly they perceive, and with great surprise and fear, that two men "in shining garments" are standing by them. The bright ones address them kindly, however, and give them the same information, and substantially the same message, as a single angel had so lately given to the other women. These remember the words of Jesus, and depart.

All the women who have been at the tomb, Mary Magdalene among the rest, seek the other disciples, at their various abodes or lodging places, and relate what they have seen and heard. The disciples in general, apostles and all, are "slow of heart to believe."

On the return of Joanna and her company, certain other persons visit the tomb, and find that His body is indeed gone — they can not tell where. On the return of these, and before hearing of his having been *seen*, Cleophas and an other disciple set out for Emmaus.

In the course of the day Jesus is seen by "Simon," alias Peter, but in what circumstances does not appear.

Toward night, Jesus converses with the two disciples on their way to Emmaus, and points out to them some of the most striking prophesies relating to the Messiah's death and resurrection. He is recognized by them at their evening meal; but on their recognition of him he presently disappears.

It is evening — the evening of the day whose

early dawn beheld Christ's resurrection. Cleophas and his fellow-disciples have returned with all speed to Jerusalem, to communicate what they have witnessed. They are greeted with the announcement, "The Lord is risen indeed, and hath appeared to Simon." A change has come over at least some of their minds. Mary Magdalene's declaration of having "seen the Lord," they had, with one consent, "believed not." The accounts of the other women concerning the angels, had "seemed to them as idle tales." But now *Peter* has seen him, and they are inclined to believe. While the two from Emmaus are giving an account of their interview with him, He suddenly stands in the midst of the company, and says, "Peace be to you."

From the suddenness of His advent among them, they are of course startled; but it also happens that they are frightened, and even terrified at His presence, notwithstanding his pacific and most friendly salutation. Having entered the room "when the doors were shut," He is looked upon as a *spirit*, in the false sense of shade or phantom; and they are afraid of such unrealities, they hardly themselves know why.

Jesus proceeds to allay the fears of the disciples — not by denouncing their superstitions, but — by presenting indubitable proofs of His personal identity, as also that his *body* is a substantial, tangible reality, and is *the* body with which they have been acquainted. Thus, he calls attention to his hands and his feet, in which the crucifixional nail-holes are freshly visible, — shows them his *side*, retaining the *gash*-like wound which the spear made by its entering diagonally, — invites them to handle, or take hold of him, and thus *know* that he actually has flesh and bones, — yea, he even takes *food*

and eats in their sight. Their fears are now, for the most part, dissipated; they are convinced that the presence before them is indeed He; and sadness and despair give place to joy and hope. He now breathes on them with a quickening spiritual influence, — points out and explains some of the Scripture prophecies relating to His sufferings, death, resurrection, &c., — and says, "As My FATHER hath sent me, even so send I you." Ten of the apostles are present at this interview — the fifth manifestation of himself on the day of his resurrection.

The apostle Thomas having been absent when Jesus showed himself to the other apostles, now declares himself totally incredulous as to our Lord's having been really present on the occasion alluded to — in like manner, as before that, the apostles had all declared themselves to be in regard to His having been really seen by some of the women. He does not doubt the honesty of his fellow-disciples who say, "We have seen the Lord;" but then he is not to be convinced in the easy way they have been. The privilege of testing the matter by the sense of *touch*, *he* would have availed himself of — indeed, he must have just that test, and can not be convinced without it. He must not merely *see* the nail-prints, but he must put his *finger* into them, — yea, he must even insert his hand into the spear-wound, — else he "will not believe."

About a week after, at a meeting of the apostles in Galilee, "as Jesus had appointed them", Thomas being present, our Lord, with His characteristic "Peace be to you," comes suddenly into their midst, as on the former occasion, "the doors being shut," in like manner as before. "Then saith He to Thomas, "Reach hither thy finger,

and behold my hands; and reach hither thy hand, and thrust it into my side; and be not faithless, but believing."

Thomas utters a couple of exclamations, or broken sentences, "My Lord! and My God"!*—the former expressive of surprise, recognition, and entire convincement, as if he had begun to say, "My Lord! it is indeed Thou"!—the latter indicating utter astonishment and superlative admiration, as if he would have said, "My God! how great is THY power!" Jesus now gently reminds Thomas that after all his talk about testing the matter by the sense of touch, he has, like the rest, believed from *seeing* Him. He then pronounces a special benediction upon those who had believed *without* actually seeing him,—thus administering a delicate reproof to the other apostles, as well as to Thomas, for discrediting the testimony of persons who saw Him before *they* did. "Thomas,"—he affectionately says,—"because thou hast seen me, thou hast believed: blessed are those who have not seen, and yet have believed."

Soon after the meeting of the eleven in Galilee, and while as yet they are in that region, Jesus shows himself to *seven* of the apostles "at the sea of Tiberias," as they are engaged in fishing. He draws forth from Peter—, who had denied Him after His apprehension,—a thrice-repeated and most solemn avowal of his *love* for Him, makes known His entire confidence in that apostle by committing to him a full share of the pastorship of His church, intimates Peter's ultimate

* "My Lord! and My God"! These two exclamations are usually taken for one quiet, unimpassioned remark; and they are *pointed* as though such, in the Common Version. But the expression is manifestly an exclamatory one; and I am convinced that the word "and" is the language—not of Thomas, but—of John, saying that Thomas said thus *and* thus.

martyrdom, and gives all to understand that John shall remain on earth until His second coming.

During the next two or three weeks, the apostles and other disciples, having become not only convinced of our Lord's actual return to life, but also somewhat accustomed to his presence in his risen state, seem to have been favored with repeated visits from Him, in which He "showed himself alive . . . . . by many infallible proofs," and also discoursed to them "of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God."

## CHAPTER XXXIV.

### CHRIST'S ASCENSION.

It is Thursday, six weeks from the time of the Passover festival — the 40th day since Jesus arose from the dead.

He has assembled his disciples, in the city of Jerusalem, seemingly for some special purpose. The impression prevails —, as on the day when he rode into the city in triumph, — that He is now about to set up His kingdom, enforce his claims to the Messiahship, and enter upon His universal and perpetual reign. It is therefore asked of Him, "Lord, wilt Thou, at this time, restore again the kingdom to Israel?"

He declines an explicit answer, yet intimates that the whole subject will be made clear to them soon — when the Holy Spirit shall have come upon them. For this they are to wait a few days, residing in the city meanwhile; and then, being "endued with power from on high," they are to preach the gospel every where, and be His "witnesses" all over the earth.

He now conducts his followers out from the city to within the precincts of Bethany, on the further side of the Mount of Olives. Several hundred persons are by this time gathered around him. With uplifted hands, he BLESSES them, after

the manner of the ancient patriarchs. Yet in all He says, he drops not a hint that they are about to witness a *miracle;* much less does he announce what it is that is so soon to happen.

Saying nothing of various undefined and perhaps conflicting emotions, who can adequately conceive the surprise, the astonishment, the wonder, the deep sense of sublimity, felt by those who witnessed the unexpected, unthought-of phenomenon of our Saviour's visible ascension? — the most stupendous miracle, no doubt, whose whole progress was ever observed by mortal eyes.

They are standing near Him. He is *blessing* them — discoursing to and of them, and of their duties and fortunes. He ceases speaking. * * * * Is it an allusion? No,— He is actually *up from the ground.* He rises. Now He is above their heads, — now, above the houses,— now, the trees. Gracefully, and majestically does He ascend, as if borne aloft by angels. Smaller, and still smaller, appears His figure, as He goes, steadily, up, up, up, — higher, higher, higher, — till suddenly enveloped by a *cloud,* His beloved form is lost to the sight.

* * * * *

Gone, and so suddenly! Will He be visible again? Will He ever return?

The whole company very naturally continue looking, — peering up into the region where they last saw Him, — till, after a little time, their attention is arrested by the discovery that "two men in white apparel" are quietly standing among them as if belonging to their number. Their presence being observed, they say to the disciples, "Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven? This same Jesus who is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen Him go into heaven."

The disciples return to Jerusalem, and wait for the descent of the Holy Spirit. Under its influence, they, in their preaching, allude to the history and death of Jesus, testify to the fact of His return to life, teach that He exists in an incorruptible state, and that he has been exalted to the dignity of a Heavenly Prince, in whose name they exhort to repentance, and promise the remission of sins. In the words of Luke, their historian, "with great power gave the apostles witness of the resurrection of the Lord Jesus."

## CHAPTER XXXV.

### PROOFS OF A FUTURE LIFE.

WHAT are the principal evidences going to establish the fact of an after-death life for man?

A good argument in support of the proposition that man is destined to an other life, is deducible from the fact that persons in all ages and in all countries have *thought* about it. The answer which a little girl is reported to have made to a skeptical philosopher, when he asked her why she thought she had "a soul," was, in the circumstances, a superlatively excellent one, whether the philosophy involved therein was, by the child, fully understood or not. "Because I have," replied she. The *gist* of this was, that if she had not had a soul, she would not have *thought* of having one. It should be observed here, that this phraseology about having a soul or not having one, was once the current language for destined to live after death, or destined to perish.

It is known concerning the ancient heathen gods and goddesses, that, originally, in the view of their most orthodox worshippers, many, if not all of them, were but deified men and women, in an extra-mundane state of existence. Indeed, it is indisputable, that in civilized countries, if in no others, men have very generally believed, with more or less clearness and strength of faith, in

some sort of life beyond the present. And this general tendency to a belief in another life, shows that it is *natural* for men thus to believe; and therefore that man's nature is *adapted* to such a life. But if so adapted, then such a life is; for it is entirely obvious that there can be no adaptation of one thing to an other, unless not merely the one thing, but also the other thing, has an actual existence.

Future existence may be after a sort admitted, and a separate or individual state, after death, denied,— it being argued that the life of each person returns to the common Source of life, as a drop of water becomes mingled with the ocean. If along with this idea, the doctrinal authority of the Scriptures would be admitted,— as was the case with the Sadducees in connection with *their* notions,— the argument employed by our Saviour against the Sadducees' doctrine, based upon the Scripture account that the Lord said to Moses, "I am the God of Abraham," &c., would be found to be perfectly conclusive against this doctrine also. The fact that Jehovah was the God of those patriarchs long after they had left the earth-life, proves, indubitably, that they, though dead as to their bodies, were yet truly living, and — of course — in a separate or individual state. But if they, then others, then "all."

Of the same kind as our Saviour's anti-Sadducean argument, is one drawn from the presence of Moses and Elias on the mount of our Lord's transfiguration. Those two ancient prophets had each a separate existence at that time, of course; and why was not this the case with each other of the then departed? And why is not the same thing true of all, at all times?

In the estimation of at least the primitive

Christians, the strongest evidence that had ever been given to man for the reality and certainty of the after-death life, was furnished by the resurrection of Jesus Christ. He had been actually dead — of this there could be no reasonable doubt. It was entirely certain, too, that after His death he had become actually alive again. And though He had reänimated his earthly body, and thus given infallible proofs of his identity, it was yet a perfectly clear case that His rising was not a mere return to this mode of being, but was a physical manifestation of the fact that He had been inducted into a higher and more *spiritual* mode of being. He could enter and leave a room with closed doors, — could appear, disappear, and reäppear, at pleasure,— seemed subject to no inconvenience from a wound in his fleshly body quite inconsistent with mere earthly life,— and at last was seen to leave the earth in an upward direction, ascending against the force of gravity, far into the ærial regions. Thus was an after-death spiritual state clearly revealed, convincing evidence of its existence having been presented to the intellect, partly through the medium of the physical senses, from the circumstance of His reässuming his physical organism, as if an habitual wearer of "sackcloth" or canvas should put on outside garments of that kind of stuff over a full new suit of the finest fabrics.

It is indisputable that in regard to life after death, the primitive Christians, on becoming Christians, became possessed of such a *hope* as they never had had before. And Peter instructs us that they became heirs to that hope by or through the fact of our Lord's resurrection:

"Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who . . . . . hath begotten us again to a lively hope by the

resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead, to an inheritance incorruptible," &c. 1 Pet. i. 3, 4.

Paul also —, when his language is rightly rendered, — speaks of Christ as being, through His resurrection, a first-fruit or sample of the departed, adding, in effect, that Christ, by His being raised, shows the resurrection of the dead, in like manner as, at the first, *some* man, through the fact of his dying, showed the death of the living:

"Christ has been raised from among the dead, a sample of those having slept. For since through a man, the death, through a man, also, the rising of the dead," 1 Cor. xv. 20, 21.

In the last verse of the above passage, the Common Version supplies the word "came"; so that we read, "For since by man *came* death, by man *came* also" &c. To me, the expression "was shown", or "was sampled", is what is there understood; for the sense of the text seems to me to be such as would be indicated by the following version:

"For since through a man [was shown] the death [of the living], through a man, also, [has been shown] the rising of the dead."

When Adam was told by the Creator that he must suffer dissolution, he was also told, in effect, that this was a result of his bodily constitution. "Dust thou art," said the Lord God, "and unto dust shalt thou return." Thus was he virtually informed of his being constitutionally mortal, as well as of the certainty of physical death to himself and all his race. But as we have no account that any person died during the first one hundred years of man's life on the earth, the murder of Abel, in the fore part of the second century, being the first recorded instance of human death, it seems altogether likely that —, healthy and vigor-

ous as, in those days, all probably were, — the specimens of humanity then extant had about as much faith in the ultimate death of the human body as, in later times, their physically diseased and enervated descendants have had in the continuous life of the human spirit. Yet if it was true that in the early times the event of human death was considered ever so probable, or even quite inevitable, this also must have been true: — when, *for the first time*, some human being was found to be certainly and irrecoverably dead, the solemn fact of man's mortality was, by the beholders, more clearly realized than it previously could have been; — the convincement that *all* must sooner or later die, came to be more strong, if not more general, than it ever had been before. The sight of a human body devoid of life, showed, as in a glass, the destiny of the race; since it can not but have been seen that, in consequence of possessing one common nature, whatever, as a fixed result of that nature, is absolutely certain to one of the race, is, for the same reason, absolutely certain to all. It might therefore, in later times, have been truly and aptly said that Abel "brought death and mortality to light, through the Law," or Mosaic history, which records his decease, — even as Jesus is declared to have "brought life and immortality to light through the Gospel," or Evangelic history, which makes known His resurrection.

The fact of an after-death life, in a higher mode of being, would doubtless have been believed by some, even though Christ has *not* been raised to mortal view. Yet those who saw Him after his resurrection, and especially those who also witnessed his ascension, must certainly have had a stronger faith, a livelier hope, a clearer spiritual

perception, than they possibly could have been possessed of before. The palpable fact that, after death, a human being had come to inherit an other and higher life, must have been viewed to be — what indeed it was — evidence approaching the clearest demonstration, that such a life is the appointed inheritance of all.

It should not be overlooked in this connection, that Jesus Christ promised special spiritual assistance to his apostles — (bestowed also upon others, but principally through the apostles,—) such assistance as we may be quite certain must have enabled them to draw from the Gospel facts correct and needful conclusions. In Christ's name, the Holy Spirit — the Comforter or Helper — even the Spirit of *truth* — was to be sent from the FATHER, for the express purpose of assisting them professionally — by bringing to their remembrance whatever of truth our Lord had taught them,— by instructing them in those truths which He had foreborne to teach for the reason that they could not then bear them,— by doing for them, in regard to Christian doctrines, all that is promised and implied in the statement, "he will guide you into all [the] truth;"—"whatever he shall hear, that will he speak," &c., &c. (See John's Gospel, Chaps. 14, 15, 16.)

In Paul's first letter to the Corinthian brethren, some of whom had denied the resurrection of the dead, at least in word, he remonstrates warmly with them for their *inconsistency* in rejecting this, while they admitted the resurrection of Christ. And he argues, and reargues, and argues again, that it was just as certain that the dead are raised as it was that Christ had been raised. And his argument obviously proceeds upon the grounds that Jesus and we possess one common nature;

also, that rising or being raised, both in His case and in ours, is as truly a normal process as is dying,— the one, no less than the other, being a natural result of the constitution given to man at his creation. Of course, the miracle of Christ's resuming his fleshly body for a very special purpose, is not embraced in his argumentation. He is obviously reasoning upon general principles:

"Now seeing Christ is preached that He has been raised from the dead, how do some among you say that there is no resurrection of the dead? Because if there is not any rising of the dead, it follows that Christ has not been raised..... We have testified concerning God, that HE raised Christ; whom HE did not raise, if, by any means, the dead are not raised. For if the dead are not raised, then Christ has not been raised..... Then, those also have perished who have fallen asleep [hoping] in Christ." 1 Cor. xv. 12—18. (See our next chapter.)

In the primitive Christian times, death by crucifixion was regarded as a most disgraceful death;— more disgraceful, indeed, than death by *hanging* is now; — and, of course, no small amount of odium had become attached to the idea of being followers of a man who had been thus put to death. To acknowledge as a religious leader, one who, by any mode of death, had publicly suffered as a malefactor, would have been deemed disgraceful enough; — but to be followers, religiously, of a cross-hanged culprit, a Jew, and a Nasarene at that, who had been led to the tree by the urgent demand of the chief men of his own nation,— how scandalously disgraceful! Surely, "the offense of the cross," which Paul makes mention of as having to be encountered in the Christian course, must, practically, have been no insignificant matter. He who, in those days, openly and faithfully preached "Jesus Christ and him crucified," must obviously have had some nerve, some decision of

character, some independence of mind, some love of truth, some regard for the best interests of mankind, some attachment to the cause of Christ, some sense of duty to God, some reliance upon spiritual aid.

There were those in the days of Paul who propagated the Christian doctrine with considerable zeal; yet, to escape "persecution for the *cross* of Christ," they sought, by a strict observance of Jewish rites, to have themselves and their converts be regarded as Jews. It was, in part, from this motive, no doubt, that in that age, and especially later, the alleged facts of the immortality of the soul, the pre-existence of souls, and other speculations of the heathen philosophers, were sometimes presented, in heathen countries, as *Christian* grounds of faith and hope, while the great fact of our Lord's *resurrection* was kept, for the most part, out of sight, it being unavoidably associated with the disgraceful fact of His public crucifixion.

From the apostle's argumentation, in 1st Corinthians, upon the topic of the resurrection, it clearly appears to me that the following view of the subject is substantially the one which he had in his mind:

The resurrection or anastasis of the dead has been occurring all along, ever since human death entered the world; so that there has been an unbroken series of resurrections from that time down to the present. Connected with this series, was the resurrection of Jesus Christ, forming an important link in the great resurrectional chain. Had He not been the Messiah, he would have been raised in the manner in which Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob had been; — not out from among the dead, but as it were along with them; — that is, not

superinvested with a fleshly body, but having a spiritual organization only; — and His rising and theirs, being equally imperceptible through the medium of the external senses, would have been equally unknown and unbelieved. But one great object of God in the mission of the Saviour, was to reveal, clearly and satisfactorily, the long uncredited fact that "the dead are raised"— that they are "living" in another mode of being. It was accordingly arranged in the Divine wisdom, that the Christ should suffer death publicly, and be entombed openly; that the fact of His being actually dead, as to this body, should be placed beyond all controversy by his body's receiving, after its life had departed, a *wound* which undeniably would have caused the departure of its life; that the tomb or sepulcher containing His remains should be sealed up by his enemies, and guarded by a band of disciplined soldiers, professedly to prevent his body's being removed; and that His friends should be known to have no idea of his returning to life, much less to life immortal. On the third-day morning, He took on his fleshly body over his spiritual organism; and subsequently, by being seen, heard, and handled, and by various other surprising manifestations, "He showed himself alive," and this too in more than a mere earthly sense, "by many infallible proofs." His being known to have arisen, he being one of the dead, and in all respects, as to nature, like them, evinces that they rise also, notwithstanding from the circumstance that they possess only spiritual bodies, the fact of their rising is not cognizable by the external senses. His resurrection being one particular in a series, one link in a chain, to learn its existence, is to learn the existence of the whole concatenation. The chain is, indeed,

naturally invisible and intangible; but it pleased God to render one of the links sensible, by investing it with corporeality; and the cognition of this through the senses has rendered the entire chain cognizable by the spiritually enlightened intellect.

With the foregoing view of the subject, what could have been more forcible, and more to the purpose, than Paul's argument? — If Christ has been raised from the dead, then the dead are raised — If the dead are not raised, then Christ has not been raised — But Christ has been raised, and so it is a fact that the dead are raised.

The primitive Christians, especially the apostles and their fellow-laborers, having been thus furnished with the most convincing and satisfactory proofs of the reality and certainty of the after-death life, in an incorruptible, immortal, and spiritual mode of existence, — and having been favored also with spiritual influences to an extraordinary extent, — became, by these means, so changed in their views and feelings as that, in the figurative language of those times, they were described as having been born again, as having been even begotten anew, as having been exalted from the present into a higher mode of life:

"Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God." 1 Pet. i. 23.

"Who..... hath begotten us again to a lively hope, by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead." 1 Pet. i. 3.

"And hath raised us up together, and made us sit together, in heavenly places in Christ Jesus." Eph. ii. 6.

Conceiving of Jesus in heaven as a veritably existing, living, thinking, knowing, feeling, acting entity, just as we conceive of some well-known friend recently gone to reside in an other locality, — regarding Him in his exalted state as a real human being, — lately in the earth-life, but now

celestialized, — lately "obedient to death," but now immortalized, — the first believers came, ere long, to regard *themselves* also as heavenly immortals, (that is, in embryo,) possessing a nature identical, of course, with His who was "made in all things like his brethren":

"Of the posterity of David according to the flesh, and declared to be the Son of God with power . . . . . by a resurrection from the dead." Rom. i. 4.

"Sons of God, being sons of the resurrection." Luke xx. 36.

"As many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are sons of God." Rom. viii. 14.

"The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are children of God." Rom. viii. 16.

"Now are we children of God; but what we shall be has not yet been manifested; we know, however, that, when it shall have been manifested, we shall be like Him; for we shall see him as He is." 1 John iii. 2.

Looking no longer upon mankind as mere animal beings, but, through the medium of their faith, discerning the spiritual element in each specimen of humanity, they, as if by a new birth, opened their eyes upon as it were a new world, peopled with new inhabitants:

"Henceforth we know no one after the flesh; yea, though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now we know him [in that manner] no more. Therefore if any one [is] in Christ, a new creation [is perceived by him]; the old things have passed away; lo! all things have become new." 2 Cor. v. 16, 17

Note. Intimately related to this department of our subject, are several highly important and interesting *moral* topics, the discussion of which belongs not properly to this work.

# CHAPTER XXXVI.

## AN IMPROVED TRANSLATION;

R, AN EXTRACT FROM "FIRST CORINTHIANS," "NEWLY TRANSLATED OUT OF THE ORIGINAL GREEK; AND WITH THE FORMER TRANSLATIONS DILIGENTLY COMPARED AND REVISED," WITH PRELIMINARY REMARKS AND APPENDANT NOTES.

### PRELIMINARY REMARKS.

1. In the following translation, the modern arbitrary divisions called "*verses*", are marked simply by figures interspersed among the words, — not by the common method of printing each verse as a separate numbered paragraph.

2. *Supplied* words and points, instead of being printed for the most part in *Italics*, as in the Common Version, are put in brackets [, thus]. They therefore may be very easily distinguished, and — if the reader so pleases — omitted. In one paragraph, (verses 42–44,) the supplies are all placed in the left-hand half of the column.

3. Should the reader choose to *omit* the supplied words, — which, of course, he is at liberty to do, even in reading the Common Version, — he will find the others to be so arranged (in this version) as that, when read without the supplies, they make the best sense the difference in idiom between Greek and English admits.

4. As in other translations, so in this, some variations in phraseology are made from the original; yet in this, as *not* in other translations, the more important of such variations are marked, *in the text*, by the presence of one or more words in Italic. The necessity for some such variations, so apparent to all translators, may be understood by the mere reader from a mention of the circumstance that in verse 19 a literal rendering involves a manifest absurdity: "we are more to be pitied than all men."

5. Over and above the remarks relating to the matter of this chapter, occurring elsewhere in this work, sundry *notes* are

appended from words and phrases by Italic letters, which notes may be worth the reader's notice.

6. The 15th chapter of 1 Corinthians being perhaps as important, in a doctrinal point of view, as is any one chapter in the New Testament, the author of this work requests his readers, for their own sakes, each one to read over the following version of said chapter several times, both with and without the supplied words, and each time in connection with the Common Version, being careful also to note the supplied words in that. Of course the reader will understand that, *in this translation*, a word or phrase in brackets should not therefore be read as a parenthesis; nor is a word or phrase in Italics commonly emphatic.

CHAP. XV. Also, I state to you, brethren, the Gospel which we preached to you, which also you received, in which also you have stood, [2] through which also you are saved, provided you [still] hold the doctrine which we announced to you in sermons, (*a*) unless, by an exception, (*b*) you believe to no purpose.

[3] For I set forth to you, in the first ones, (*c*) what also I received, that Christ died for our sins, in accordance with the Scriptures; [4] and that he was buried, and that he has been raised the third day, in accordance with the Scriptures; [5] and that he was seen by *Peter*, then by [most of] *the apostles*. (*d*)

[6] Afterward, [I set forth that] (*e*) He was seen by above five hundred brethren at once of whom the greater number remain until now, while some have fallen asleep. [7] Afterward, [that] He was seen by James, then by all the apostles. [8] And, last of all, [that] He was seen by me also, as by one born out of due time.

[9] For I am the least of the apostles, who am not worthy to be called an apostle, because I persecuted the Church of God. [10] Yet, through the grace of God, I am what I am; and HIS grace, as [bestowed] upon me, was not [bestowed] in vain;

but I labored more abundantly than all of them; not I, however, but the grace of God as [thus] with me. [11] Therefore, whether I or they [do the work], so we preach, and so you believed.

[12] Now, seeing Christ is preached that He has been raised from the dead, how do some among you say that there is no resurrection (*f*) of the dead? [13] Because if there is not any rising (*f*) of the dead, it follows that Christ has not been raised. [14] And if Christ has not been raised, idle, of course, [is] our preaching, and idle, also, your faith. [15] Yea, also, we are found false witnesses [as to the doings] of God; in that we have testified concerning God, that HE raised Christ; whom HE did not raise, if, by any means, the dead are not raised.

[16] For if the dead are not raised, then Christ has not been raised. [17] And if Christ has not been raised, worthless [is] your faith; you are still in your sins. [18] Then, those also have perished who have fallen asleep [hoping] in Christ. [19] If we have hope in Christ solely in regard to this life, we are *the most* to be pitied *of* all men. [20] In the *existing* (*g*) state of things, however, Christ has been raised from among (*h*) the dead, a sample of those having slept. [21] For since through a man, [was shown] the death [of the living], through a man, also, [has been shown] the rising (*f*) of the dead. [22] For even as all die in [connection with] Adam, so, also, shall all be quickened in [connection with] Christ. [23] But every one [shall be quickened] among the band to which he belongs: Christ, [is] a sample [of the present band]; afterward, [are] those [who shall be quickened through the agency] of Christ, at His arrival. [24] Then, [is] the end, — (*i*) at which time He will deliver up the kingdom to God, even the FATHER, — at which time He will have overruled all rule, and all authority, and power.

25 For he must reign till he shall have put all enemies under his feet. 26 The last enemy *to* (*j*) be struck down, [is] death. 27 For HE "put all things in subjection under His feet." Yet when it says, [ (in amount,) ] "All things have been put in subjection," manifest [is this], that excepted, [is] HE having put all things in subjection to Him. 28 And when all things have submitted to Him, then also will the Son himself submit himself to HIM having put all things in subjection to Him, that GOD may be all in all.

29 Indeed, what shall those do who are baptized in reference to (*k*) the dead, if the dead are not raised at all? *Why*, then, are they baptized in reference to (*k*) them? 30 *Why*, also, do we place ourselves in peril every hour? 31 I protest, by the feeling of pride which I have as to you, in regard to Christ Jesus our Lord, I am [, in liability,] put to death daily.

32 Although, [speaking] in relation to *men*, I encountered wild beasts at Ephesus, what advantage [is it] to me? If the dead are not raised, let us eat, and let us drink, for to-morrow we *are no more*. (*l*)

33 Be not deceived; evil associations corrupt good habits. 34 Arouse yourselves in the manner requisite, and sin not; for some *are ignorant* of God, I speak [this] to your shame.

35 But some one will say, "How are the dead raised? and with what body do they come?" 36 Foolish one! that which thou sowest is not quickened, if it does not die. 37 And [in sowing] that which thou sowest, thou sowest not the body which will spring into being; but [thou sowest] a mere kernel; perhaps [a kernel] of wheat, or [, perhaps,] of some one of the *other grains;* 38 and God gives a body to [the germ within] it, accord-

ing as He willed; also, to each of the seeds, [He thhs gives] its proper body.

39 (Not all flesh, [is] the same flesh [in kind]; but one [kind of flesh], [is the flesh] of men; and an other flesh, [is that] of beasts; and an other, [that] of fishes; and an other, of birds. 40 Also, [tuere are] heavenly bodies, and [there are] earthly bodies; but the glory of the heavenly, [is] one, and that of the earthly, [is] another. 41 Of the sun, [there is] one glory; and of the moon, an other glory; and of [each of] the stars, an other glory; for star differs from star in glory.) 42 In like manner also,

| | |
|---|---|
| is brought about | the raising (*f*) of the dead: |
| that pertaining to us which is symbolized by a kernel of grain, | is sown in corruptibility; |
| that within us answering to what becomes unfolded into a plant, | is raised in incorruptibility; 43 |
| the former of these | is sown in dishonor; |
| the latter | is raised in glory: |
| the former | is sown in weakness; |
| the latter | is raised in power: 44 |
| the former | is sown an animal body; |
| the latter | is raised a spiritual body. |

There is an animal body, and there is a spiritual body. 45 And so it has been written [that] the first "man" — Adam — "became a living animal;" (*m*) the last Adam, [has become] (*n*) a quickening spirit. 46 Not first, however, [was] the

spiritual One; but on the contrary, the animal One; afterward, the spiritual One. [47] The first man, [was] from the earth, earthly; the second man, [is] *from heaven, heavenly.* (*o*) [48] As [was] the earthly One, such, also, [are] the earthly ones; and as [is] the heavenly One, such, also, [are] the heavenly ones. [49] And in like manner as we took on the image of the earthly One, we shall also take on the image of the heavenly One. [50] Yea, I say this, brethren, that flesh and blood can not inherit the kingdom of God nor does corruptibility inherit incorruptibility.

[51] Lo! I tell you a secret: We shall not all sleep indeed, (*p*) yet we [who shall not sleep] shall all be changed, [52] in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trumpet; for a trumpet will sound, and the dead will have been raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed. [53] For this, [which is clothed with] the corruptible, must be clothed with incorruptibility; and this, [which is clothed with] the mortal, [must] be clothed with immortality. [54] So when this, [which is clothed with] the corruptible, shall have been clothed with incorruptibility, and this, [which is clothed with] the mortal, shall have been clothed with immortality, then will have been brought to pass the saying which has been written, [that] "Death is swallowed up in victory."

[55] Death, where [is] thy sting? Unseen state, where [is] thy victory? [56] Now the sting of death, [is] sin; and the strength of sin [is] the law. [57] But thanks [be] to God, The One giving us the victory, through our Lord Jesus Christ.

[58] Now therefore, my beloved brethren, be steadfast, immovable, always abounding in the work of the Lord, knowing that your labor in [conjunction with] the Lord, (*q*) is not in vain.

## NOTES.

(*a*) "Announced to you in sermons." Same as "preached to you," in verse 1. The more diffuse rendering is adopted in verse 2, as being conducive to a readier understanding of an expression in verse 3, namely, "in the first ones."

(*b*) "Unless, by an exception." The word "*ektos*," here rendered "by an exception," is the one rendered "excepted" in verse 27. In this place, it is usually not rendered at all; unless its sense is considered as included in the word "unless," the entire phrase, "*ektos ei me*" being thus rendered by this one word. But the two particles *ei me* = if not, are fully equivalent to "unless;" hence, in this regard of the "authorities," who perhaps had no clear perception of a *present* salvation, I venture to give this word a separate rendering. (By an exception.)

(*c*) "In the first ones." This obviously imports "in the first sermons" or "discourses."

(*d*) "[Most of] *the apostles*." In Greek, "the twelve," — a metonymical expression for the apostles, not necessarily including the entire number. And that *not* all of even the eleven apostles were meant to be represented by Paul as having been present at the interview adverted to, is evident from his soon afterward mentioning "*all* the apostles." (Verse 8.) It is for this reason that I supply, in verse 5, the subtractive expression, ["most of."]

(*e*) "[I set forth that]." I supply these words in verse 6, from a settled conviction that the apostle is *not* here declaring the order of Christ's *appearings*, but is simply recounting the order in which himself had "set forth" such appearings, or the chief of them. For the same reason I supply "[that]" in verses 7 and 8. See Chaps. xxxi., xxxiii.

(*f*) "Resurrection" — "Rising" — "Raising." From the same word, (Anastasis.) This imports, literally, a re-standing, or standing again, or a causing of some one to do so; which is to say a rising, or a raising; but it by no means imports a *re*-rising or raising, — a rising or raising *again*, — as may seem to be indicated by the Latin-English word *re*surrection. See Chap. ii. of this work.

(*g*) "In the *existing* state of things." Literally, "at this very time" — equivalent to "in the *now present* state of things," and implying, of course, their *existing* state, as contrasted with the *hypothetical* or non-existing state of things presented in verses 13 – 19.

(*h*) "From among the dead." Same as "from the dead" in verse 12. The less concise rendering is given in verse 20, for the purpose of presenting the apostle's argument in — as near as may be — its original force. See Chap. iii. of this work.

(*i*) "Then, [is] the end." See last chapter of this work, at the close of which this sentence — printed in a somewhat different manner — is quoted as a fitting *finale.*

(*j*) "To be struck down." The Greek here is usually rendered into the *indicative* future; but as the sense seems to require the infinitive, I employ it — the present in a future sense. N. B. The rendering in the Common Version is *equivalent* to the infinitive: "The last enemy *that* shall be destroyed," &c.

(*k*) "In reference to." This rendering is purposely less specific than the original. From our ignorance as to what particular circumstances are here alluded to, the original is, *to us*, ambiguous, and hence, in effect, indeterminate. We know not whether the sense intended is, "in behalf of the dead," or "in place of the dead;" — I therefore give a rendering which is consistent with either sense, and so not specifically equal to the one, nor to the other. See the Commentaries.

(*l*) "We *are no more.*" Greek, "we die." But, *in this text*, the apostle evidently uses "die" in the no-future-life sense—I therefore translate as above. Compare verse 18.

(*m*) "A living animal." Commmonly rendered "a living *soul*," as in Gen. ii. 7. The apostle manifestly *quotes* that text, at least in substance; but the word "soul," as Moses is there made to use it, indisputably signifies "creature," if not "animal;"— yea, since the part there described is certainly man's bodily structure, it is plain that the full sense is "*earthly* creature," to express which idea, "animal" is the best word we have. For the various significations of *psuche*, here rendered "animal," and commonly rendered "soul," see Chap. ii. Observe, also, that the apostle *contrasts* the first man with Christ, who—he tells us—is "a quickening *spirit.*"

(*n*) "[Has become]." Though these two words are marked as a supply, they are not *wholly* so. The expression rendered "became," in the first part of the text, is a verb with a *preposition* following it; and in the last part of the text, though the verb is omitted, the preposition is retained, — as if one should say in English, The first "man"— Adam — "*was made into* a living animal;" the last Adam, *into* a quickening spirit.

(*o*) "*From heaven, heavenly.*" The reading of the standard Greek text in this place, is, "the Lord from heaven," as in the Common Version. And though a majority of the external

evidence is in favor of such reading, I cannot resist the conviction that the *autographic* reading was "from heaven, heavenly." But the question is one of minor importance.

(*p*) "Shall not all sleep, indeed." The particle "*men*," which I here render "indeed," is commonly not rendered in this text at all. It *may* indeed be a mere expletive, here; yet I can not so consider it. A delicate shade of meaning it has, indeed; but—to me—it is by no means meaningless.

(*q*) "In [conjunction with] the Lord." See 1 Cor. iii. 9; 2 Cor. vi. 1.

## CHAPTER XXXVII.

### THE END OF HUMAN MORTALITY.

As has been abundantly shown in the course of this work, especially in Chap. xxxv, the resurrection of Jesus Christ from among the dead furnishes unequivocal and decisive proof that a spiritual immortal life awaits each mortal of the human race. Yet connected with the subject of man's ultimate destiny, are certain questions not quite devoid of interest, to which the fact of his having been raised furnishes no adequate answer. For example,

1. Will there always be, as now, human beings on earth in a state of mortality, coming into existence here, sojourning here for a time, and then departing into the unseen state?

2. If so, how can *death* ever be "swallowed up in victory"? and thus "the last enemy" be *destroyed*, as the Scriptures so plainly teach? Besides, as we learn from the first chapter of Genesis, it was a purpose of God in the creation of man, that this earth should ultimately be *replenished* or filled up — which, in this case, is to say overspread — with human inhabitants; and in the ages *after* (or in deed at *any* time after) the earth shall have become thus peopled to fulness, how will it be possible for human beings to find for themselves sufficient *elbow-room*, and provide for themselves a sufficient

amount of *food*, to say nothing of other necessaries? And being straitened in these, how shall the work of physical, intellectual, moral, and religious progress continue, so that the *other* "enemies" shall be *put under* Christ's feet, and there remain?

3. If there will *not* always be human beings in this mortal state, how will the race be disposed of? Will its immense numbers be removed by death? or will they be "translated," as were Enoch and Elijah? Will the earth be depopulated suddenly? or will its inhabitants disappear in gradual succession, till the last one shall have no fellow-mortal to witness his exit?

If we had no special revelation upon this subject, it seems to me that to the above and some similar questions, all our reasonings, from not only the Great Fact above mentioned, but from all the facts within our acquaintance, *might* fail of furnishing a clear and satisfactory answer. Yet what is to be the ultimate destiny of the *race*, is a question of some interest, as well as what is to be the destiny of an *individual* of the race. Accordingly,— so I understand the Scriptures,— an express revelation was granted to the apostle Paul touching this very subject,— the matter of which revelation he communicates in the words following, according to the Common Version:

"Now this I say, brethren, that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God; neither doth corruption inherit incorruption. Behold, I show you a mystery; we shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump: for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed. For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality. So when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality, then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory." 1 Cor. xv. 50–54.

"But I would not have you to be ignorant, brethren, concerning those who are asleep, that ye sorrow not, even as others who have no hope. For if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so those also who sleep in Jesus will God bring with him. For this we say to you by the word of the Lord, that we who are alive and remain to the coming of the Lord shall not prevent those who are asleep. For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God: and the dead in Christ shall rise first: then we who are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air, and so shall we ever be with the Lord." 1 Thess. iv. 13–17.

The passages just cited are supposed to teach—, and in stronger and more direct terms than do any other Scriptures,— the doctrine that the immortalization of all mankind, from Adam down to the latest last-born of the race, is, at some period hereafter, to take place simultaneously, or at least in very nearly the same instant of time. Yet that those passages really teach a future simultaneous rising of all the dead, and especially that such rising is to happen at the time when shall occur the revealed change of all the living equivalent to dying and rising, the writer of this is quite unable to believe; and he will present, in this place, at least one *special* reason for such inability.

The *change* of which the apostle speaks, is to take place "in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump." If, now, the rising of all the dead is also to take place "at the last trump," then, of course, both the resurrection *and* the change are to happen *within* the one brief period designated, (Literally, "an atom," or an ultimate particle, not susceptible of division.) And yet the apostle assures the brethren, and this too, as he claims, "by the word of the Lord," that the dead are all to be raised *before* any of the living are to experience the change mentioned. It is

thus a matter of actual revelation, that the former of these operations is to be wholly accomplished before the latter is to be begun; and, provided the interpretation in question is certainly correct, it is also a matter of actual revelation, that the said operations, separately and consecutively, first the one, and then the other, are to be commenced, and carried on, and consummated, in as brief a space of time as is taken up by the involuntary act of shutting and opening the eye!

"I show you a mystery; [*or* secret:] We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump."

"This we say to you by the word of the Lord, that we who are alive . . . . . shall not prevent [*or* precede] those who are asleep. For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven . . . . . with the trump of God: and the dead in Christ shall rise first: then we who are alive shall be caught up," &c.

The rising mentioned is thus clearly to happen *before* the other event; that is, it is to happen "first," and the other is not to "*pre*vent," precede, or be before it. How long first is it to happen? A *fraction* of "an *atom*" of time — partly as long first as it takes the eye to twinkle! I have never meant to be unreasonably hard of belief; but, verily, it is quite impossible for me to yield credence to the idea that a special revelation was granted to the apostle for the mere purpose of making known so insignificant a circumstance as this.

My view of the passages will now be presented:

The "coming" of Christ, as *here* mentioned, I take to be — not his figurative, virtual coming, arrival, or presence, at the close of the Jewish age, but — a literal, personal coming, arrival, and presence, at the close of the Christian age. Some of my reasons follow:

**1.** When Jesus ascended from the side of mount

Olivet, it was said to the disciples, "This same Jesus who is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven." This language unequivocally promises a bodily coming. If His attested ascension was a literal, personal going up, His *then* predicted descension was to be a literal, personal coming down.

2. In the passage in hand from Thessalonians, the apostle announces that "the Lord *himself* shall descend from heaven." This, to me, is as if he had said, "The Lord Jesus personally."

When the apostle says, "We shall not all sleep," his meaning manifestly is, that not all the race will *die*, sleep being put for physical death. Yet when to this denial he appends the affirmation, "but we shall all be changed", I do not understand him as declaring that *all the race* will be changed, but only as declaring that those will be changed who shall not sleep (or die), and who, of course, will not be raised (or awaked). As if he had said, "we shall not all sleep, yet we [who shall not sleep] shall all be changed." Among my reasons for thus limiting the reference of his second proposition, is the circumstance that — seemingly in explanation — he presently adds, "the *dead* shall be RAISED . . . . . and *we* shall be CHANGED." It is easy to see that, in this text, "we" and "the dead" are placed in entire and exclusive *contrast*, neither company including any part of the other.

An apparent *discrepancy* exists between the teachings of verses 51 and 52; but —, to say the least of it,— such discrepancy appears none the less real if we adhere to the interpretation usually given, than it does if we adopt the one herein offered. Indeed, upon my view of their import, the latter verse is manifestly explanatory of the

former; — as if the apostle, not quite satisfied with the expressions in verse 51, ("we shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed,") put forth the latter part of verse 52 partly to fix their meaning. ("The dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed.") Note. It argues nothing against Paul's inspiration, if he — a Jew — was not always able to express his ideas *in Greek* with entire clearness, off-hand. And employing an amanuensis, as he for the most part did, it is obvious that he would not be likely to pre-study *every* expression; and in case what he had dictated were perceived to be faulty, might he not more easily dictate an explanatory remark, than oversee an erasure and emendation?

The raising of the dead, *in whole*, is obviously a future work; and a future work it must constantly be till the last one shall have been raised. The use of the future tense in the affirmation rendered "the dead shall be raised," is therefore as clearly proper upon the view that we are raised at death, as it is upon any other. And there are at least *two* good reasons why the verb "to be raised" should here be put into what might be called the perfect future tense, — indicating a future time having the same relation to some other future time that the perfect has to the present, — so that the text, when properly translated throughout, shall read, "for a trumpet will sound, and the dead *will have been raised* incorruptible, and we shall be changed." Thus,

First. Paul distinctly affirms of the *change* mentioned, that it shall be "AT the last trump"; and he *as* distinctly affirms of the rising mentioned, that *it* shall be "first." This plainly makes the time of the resurrection to be *anterior* to the sounding of the trump, as has been before argued.

Second. In Corinthians, the apostle applies the present tense to the resurrection a dozen or more of times *before* he speaks of the trump and the attendant change. When, therefore, he speaks of the raising of the future dead, he must have viewed them as certain to be all raised by the time the trumpet should sound. Note. A rendering like the one proposed, and for a similar reason, occurs in the second verse following: "So when this corruptible *shall have put on*," &c.

The foregoing remarks upon the text, "We shall not all sleep," &c., are made upon the well-nigh unquestionable position, that the present reading of the text, namely,

> "Pantes men ou koimethesometha
> pantes de allagesometha,"

is, every jot and tittle the same as was the *autographic* reading. The author of this work is far from taking the opposite of this position; but it has been suggested to him as a not unreasonable *conjecture*, that in the autograph of this epistle, the adjective pronoun παντες = *pantes*, all, did not occur in the second line of this text, but only in the first line; and that in the second line, instead of this word, the adverb παντη = *pante*, wholly, was the term employed. Were this the existing reading, it would be the more readily seen that the expression "hoi me koimethesomenoi" = the ones who shall not sleep, is really *understood* in the second line, thus making the sense to be, "We shall not all sleep, indeed, yet we [who shall not sleep] shall be wholly changed." Note. It is unquestionably the *body* that *dies* literally, or that *sleeps* in the sense evidently here intended. (See Chaps. ii, x, xii.) It must therefore be entirely clear that the *change* in mention relates directly to

bodily organization; so that being "wholly" changed would, in this place, import merely taking a body of which the animal one forms no part.

N. B. So little does the above-mentioned conjecture affect my argument, and with so little favor is every thing of this sort usually regarded, that I should not have noticed it here, were it not that the apparent discrepancy existing between verses 51 and 52, would by such a reading be wholly or mainly done away.

As to the text in Thess., "we . . . . . shall be caught up together with them," &c., which is taken to mean that the raised dead, as well as the changed living, are to be caught up, I observe that the import of the original is — not this, but — simply that the living are to be caught up at once, or without delay; and that in the act of going to meet the Lord in the air, they shall come to be with the raised dead, whom GOD will "bring" with the Lord. "In *the* clouds," is rightly "in clouds", that is, in multitudes.

I offer the following as a correct translation of the passage in mention; though a less literal one, in regard to *some* of the expressions, might probably be preferable:

"But we would not have you ignorant, brethren, concerning the ones having fallen asleep, that ye be not grieved in the same manner as the rest, the ones not having a hope. For if, as we believe, Jesus died and arose, so, also, will God, through Jesus, bring with him the ones having fallen asleep.* For this we say to you by the word of the Lord, that we, the ones living, the ones remaining until the arrival of the Lord, shall by no means precede the ones having fallen asleep. For the Lord himself, with word of command, with voice of archangel, and with trumpet of God, shall come down from heaven: (but the dead shall have been raised in Christ† first:) upon which

* More literally, "For if we believe that Jesus died and arose, so also will God," &c.

† "In Christ." For some remarks upon this phrase, see Chap. v.

we, the ones living, the ones remaining, shall at once be caught up, in clouds, along with them, in going to meet the Lord in the air ; and so we shall always be with the Lord."

In perfect accordance with the foregoing view of the apostle's teachings, is the circumstance that he does not teach the absolute universality of either death or the resurrection. He indeed declares that " as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive " or quickened ; but he does not affirm that all shall be *raised,* nor yet that all will *die.* The perceptible fact that all *do* die, is in no way inconsistent with the position that *not* all *will* die. So, also, being quickened, or made alive, is clearly distinguishable from being raised; for the Saviour says, " The Father raiseth the dead, AND quickeneth." * It therefore is evidently quite possible for all and each to be quickened or made alive with celestial life, and rendered incorruptible and immortal, although, at the last, some shall not die, — figuratively, shall not sleep, or fall, — and so, of course, are not represented as being to be awaked, or raised, but only to be changed.

In accordance, too, with the doctrine that all die, and are raised, and of course also, are quickened, yet that, at the last, *some* shall be celestially quickened without dying and being raised, is the fact that in 1st Corinthians, immediately upon declaring that all shall be made alive, or quickened, the apostle adds, " But every man in his own order;"— properly, " band," or " company: "— thus intimating that, as regards the circumstances attendant upon our celestialization, the great army of humanity consists of more than one division. The passage, without supplied words, is literally as fol lows

" For even as all die in Adam, so, also, shall all be quicken-

* For some remarks upon the quickening process, see Chap. iv.

ed in Christ. But every one among the band to which he belongs: Christ, a sample; afterward, those of Christ at His arrival. Then, the end, — at which time," &c.

The circumstance adverted to by Paul in Thessalonians, that "Jesus died and arose," with the implied fact of His being "quickened," (which fact *Peter* expressly mentions,[1]) constitutes our Saviour a sample or specimen of mankind in general: and these compose one band or company; while those who are to be *changed*, and of course to be quickened, make up an other. That we shall die, we infer as certain from the fact that those of former generations have died, Jesus among the rest, and so have many of our contemporaries. That "the dead are raised," and that we *shall* be raised, is a like inference from various considerations, but more than all else, from the stupendous Fact that God raised Christ. Says Paul,— by a proper rendering,—"Christ has been raised from among the dead, a sample of those having slept."

Jesus Christ is to reign in His kingdom "till he shall have put all enemies under his feet; — which is to say, till He shall have destroyed, immolated, or struck them down; — and the last one — we learn — will be "death." The destruction of death is to be effected instantaneously, and by what may be called miraculous agencies; that of the others, by the gradual and slow process of physical, intellectual, moral, and religious reform, in connection with individual, societal, national, and cosmical progress. But the destruction of death by the change mentioned, is not to take place until all other enemies shall have been disposed of; — we may, therefore, be entirely certain that the persons then alive on the earth will be such as Christianity aims to make mankind,— which

[1] 1 Peter iii. 18.

circumstance may perhaps have some relation to the fact that after saying "Christ, a sample," the apostle at once subjoins, "afterward, those of Christ at His arrival." Earth's human inhabitants will doubtless then be "OF Christ" in the highest earthly sense, by being in the highest earthly sense *like* Him.

In regard to *death's* being an "enemy," we are competent to understand that at any time prior to the change mentioned, mankind, whatever their degree of improvement, or however strong and clear their faith, will still be corruptible and mortal —as truly so as are we. At some period in man's earthly history, death may not only be painless, but it may also be *believed* so to be; it may, at that period, have become divested of the very last vestige of those terrors with which ignorance, superstitions, and wrong-doing have hitherto invested it; — yet it can not *then* be an entire stranger, any more than it is even now; nor can the *decay* incident to old age be altogether absent, any more than it is at present. In the happiest of those happy days near the close of the Saviour's blissful reign, when all on earth shall live in love and harmony; and when long life shall be the certain inheritance of all; — the dear, venerable, age-surviving, many-times-great GRANDPARENTS, the objects of so much esteem and reverence from their multitudinous descendants, and whom their literally aged Children (, with *their* children and children's children of far distant degrees,) will love so well, and so well love to do for, must at length come to be weak in body, and somewhat enfeebled in mind,— must, at last, inevitably leave vacant the Center of the family circle. May we not rationally conclude that, even in that millennial age, death will still be considered an evil? the more

so, perhaps, as the evils then existing will be comparatively few and slight, will be rapidly diminishing in number, magnitude and intensity, will, ultimately, be reduced to this alone?

The following text seems to require some exposition in this connection. I give it a more literal rendering than does the Common Version:

"For this, the corruptible, must be clothed with [*or* clothe itself with] incorruptibility; and this, the mortal, be clothed with [*or* clothe itself with] immortality.

Just what it is that is here alluded to as being corruptible, or what it is that is alluded to as being mortal, is not directly said; but the corruption and the death *implied*, are evidently physical. The verb which the Common Version here renders "put on," relates to *clothing*, and has a form adapted to the *reflective* sense; as, to clothe *itself* with, to envelop *itself* in, &c.; but it is not commonly supposed that the apostle intended to convey more than the mere *passive* sense of *being* clothed with.

The Greek of the passage (, in Roman letters,) is,

"Dei gar to phtharton touto endusasthai aphtharsian, kai to thneton touto endusasthai athanasian."

It will thus be seen by even the mere reader of Greek, that the phrases commonly rendered "this corruptible" and "this mortal," are, literally, "this, the corruptible," "this, the mortal." And according to a well-known Greek idiom, the expressions, "the corruptible" and "the mortal" *may* import the abstract ideas of corruptibility and mortality. In 2d Cor. v. 4, the only place in the Common Version where "mortality" occurs, this word is actually a rendering of "to thneton," the very expression usually rendered "mortal" in the text under consideration.

Let it now be supposed and — for the time — admitted, that in the Greek of the text in hand, as given above, an expression importing the thing clothed with, or the thing enveloped in, is really *understood*, in each line, after "touto" = this. The true sense of the original, then,— and a very reasonable sense, too,— must be such as would be indicated by the rendering given below, "the corruptible" and "the mortal" being taken to mean corruptibility and mortality:

"For this, which is clothed with the corruptible, must be clothed with incorruptibility; and this, which is clothed with the mortal, must be clothed with immortality." (See the preceding chapter, where the supplied words in the above are put in brackets.)

I am quite aware, however, that the reader may not be at all disposed permanently to concede the point, that in the text in hand such an expression is really understood as I have above supposed. Let us then consider the text as it stands: "This corruptible must put on," &c.; or "This, the corruptible, must be clothed with," &c.; or, perhaps, "must clothe itself with," &c.

Is it the *soul* or *spirit* of man which is to be thus clothed or is to clothe itself with incorruptibility and immortality? If it is, then the spirit must be not only mortal, as some hold, but also corruptible, or liable to putrefaction, as nobody holds.

Is it to be supposed that this mortal and corruptible *body* of flesh and blood, is — actively or passively — to be invested with incorruptibility and immortality, like a poor perishable *mushroom* encased in a net-work of fine gold, thickly set with the costliest and most splendid of precious stones? Not only does common sense give her voice in the negative, but the apostle, three verses previous, as if for the express purpose of forestalling so un-

reasonable a supposition, premises thus: "Now this I say, brethren, that flesh and blood can not inherit the kingdom of God." Note. In this text, the expression "kingdom of God" seems to bear an unusual sense, and refer exclusively to the celestial state.

As has been shown, the phrases commonly here rendered "this corruptible" and "this mortal", are, literally, "this, the corruptible", "this, the mortal"; and an adjective of the singular number, preceded by what we call the definite article, *may* be equivalent to an abstract noun. With this interpretation, (no word or phrase being understood by which the sense of the text is at all mollified,) the affirmation of the apostle here is, "This corruption [*or* corruptibility] must put on [, *or* be clothed with, *or* clothe itself with,] incorruption [*or* incorruptibility];" and so of the latter half of the text. But such can not be the sense intended to be expressed; for, aside from the fact that such a sense would be closely akin to nonsense, the apostle, after making the allegation just cited as to flesh and blood's having power to inherit the kingdom of God, subjoins, in unequivocal language, "neither doth corruption [*or* corruptibility] inherit incorruption [*or* incorruptibility.]

Is it *man*, generically, that, by action, or by reception, is to be thus clothed? Perhaps the language of the text, taken by itself, might bear this interpretation; but the two following considerations are quite sufficient to show that such can not possibly have been the apostle's meaning:

1. Such an interpretation would suppose that the apostle viewed the resurrection to be exclusively future; whereas, as we have seen, he unequivocally taught, after the manner of the Saviour, that "the dead *are* raised." See Chap. xxviii.

2. To say of the earthly living, that they are mortal and also corruptible, — liable to death, and also to corruption, — is clearly an appropriate remark; but to speak of those who both died and "saw corruption" thousands of years ago, as being still corruptible and mortal, — what is it but nonsense of the sheerest kind?

If the text is to be taken as not at all *elliptical*, that is, as requiring in English no supplied words for the better expression of its actual sense, — and this may perhaps be the fact, — then the true reference of the text must be seen to be — not to mankind in general, but — to those, and to those only, who shall be alive on the earth at the close of Christ's reign on the earth. Then, too, its language must be descriptive of events after the manner of their *apparent* character, and not strictly according to philosophical reality. The text, as thus viewed, is clearly seen to be no part of the apostle's general argument, based upon the resurrection of Christ, but to belong to the disclosure the "mystery" or secret he had just announced, namely, that not all the human race will die and be raised, yet that those who will not, will experience an instantaneous equivalent change. And in this view of the text, may not its language be *descriptive* of the change mentioned, as such change really *looked* to Paul when the process was shown to him — as it likely had been — in vision or otherwise.

If the word "body" is to be considered as understood in the text, in such manner that its sense is, "this corruptible [body] must be clothed with [*or* must clothe itself with]" &c., then, most certainly, its language describes things and events in the light of their *appearance* only; and the reality concealed under such appearance can hard-

ly be supposed to be any other than this, that, as in the case of mankind in general, so in the case of those who shall not die and be raised, the corruptible and mortal body of each is destined to be *superseded* by an incorruptible and immortal one.

Suppose the change in mention to consist in parting with the earthly body, (and of course with its life,) and in having a heavenly one in its stead,* duly quickened with celestial life ; suppose the earthly body to be,—as the Apostle elsewhere tells of,—"dissolved," or resolved into invisible atoms ; and suppose all this to transpire —, as he here says, —"in the twinkling of an eye." The *rationale* of the change would then seem to be, that the spiritual body is developed interiorly, and becomes celestially quickened ; the animal body is dissipated exteriorly, and at once perishes ; — this body is now in view, the next instant, that. Would not such a process naturally *look* to a beholder as if the animal body took on the spiritual one, or became enveloped in it ? — thus calling to mind the words of the prophet where he tells of *death's* being "*swallowed up* in victory" ?

In that text already adverted to, where alone the word "mortality" occurs in the Common Version, the apostle not only mentions "to thneton" = the mortal, as he does in the text in hand, but he also, as here, uses the word rendered "swallowed up," speaking of "the mortal" as destined to be "swallowed up by life." He also, as in the text in hand, *seems* to set forth that the heavenly body is to be taken on *over* or in addition to the earthly one, using a word rendered "clothed upon", which word, primarily, has specific reference to the

* "In its stead." The words rendered "shall be changed" in 1 Cor. xv. 51, 52, sometimes signifies to *ex*change, or give one thing for an other.

putting on of one garment over an other. See Chap. xxi.

The change in mention is unquestionably to be effected by the power of God; but this power seems to have been delegated to Christ, he being, in his heavenly state, denominated "a quickening spirit."

And in the original of the phrase from Paul, "those of Christ at His arrival," the first three words, commonly rendered "those who are Christ's," I conceive to be an *elliptical* expression for what would be properly rendered "those who shall be quickened through Christ," that is, through the *agency* of Christ. I thus deem the true sense of the passage to be substantially such as is indicated by the following translation, which — it will be perceived — is, in part, a paraphrase:

"For even as all die in connection with Adam, so, also shall all be quickened in connection with Christ. But every one shall be quickened among the band to which he belongs: Christ, is a sample of the present band; afterward, are those who shall be quickened through the agency of Christ, at His arrival. Then, is the end, -- at which time he will deliver up the kingdom to God," &c. (See the preceding chapter, where the supplied words are duly marked.)

The mode of operation in the production of the revealed change, may, by some, be accounted as wholly unrevealed, and, by others, (very possibly,) as none of our business. I however venture a few brief suggestions.

From various Scripture accounts, it would seem that the known presence of even one celestial being, especially if such being is so manifested as to be plainly beheld with the physical eye, is directly calculated to produce considerable disorganizing effects upon our physical bodies. The perceptible character of these effects has, indeed,

been different with different persons, being modified, perhaps, by their differing spiritual conditions. Thus, while some have been affected apparently by a mild, transforming influence, operating as if mesmerically, — others have seemed acted upon by a violent, disintegrating force, acting as if mechanically. In some, the inner organism seems to have received strength and development.

When the Lord Jesus shall personally come from heaven in the end of His reign, those having fallen asleep in death are to come —, as we learn, — along with Him. The living are then to be caught up from the earth to *meet* Him; and in the act of going to meet the Lord in the air, they are to be attended by the raised dead — by those who, in Scripture phrase, shall have slept. These, then, must certainly descend to at least very near the earth's surface, and, in all probability, will be discernible by the natural eye.

Suppose, now, that on, — on, — in the far future of Christ's reign on the earth, man in this mortal state has come to have literally fulfilled the primeval benedictive volition of his Maker, "replenish the earth"; that is, fill it up, or overspread its surface with human inhabitants.

Suppose, also, that through the agency of Christianity coupled with science and rendered effective by spiritual influences, all Christ's terrestrial subjects — the entire human race upon earth — have become humanly perfect; — physically, intellectually, morally, and religiously thus; and that, in accordance with this, not only all intellectual, moral, and religious wrongs have utterly ceased, but also that all physical evils —, death excepted, — have either passed away, or become effectually neutralized.

Suppose, moreover, that being "Lord of all,"

both " dead and living," the Saviour has sought and secured the best interests of God's offspring universally, — not alone on earth, but also in the invisible state, — so that all human beings, every where, are progressing in knowledge, goodness, and happiness, to the full extent of their ever-increasing capacities.

Suppose, still further, that all this being effected, the exalted Redeemer, in pursuance of an age-remembered promise, literally descends, *in propria persona*, from the highest heaven, (speaking in relation to man,) and —, attended by the angels, the apostles, the martyrs, the patriarchs, the prophets, the whole company of the deceased, — arrives at some point within the earth's atmosphere; that, with archangelic voice, as if the same were modulated through GOD'S own trumpet, He then and there gives forth the word of command; and that a delegation numbering many thousands of millions, — the official mediums, the active vehicles, of His vivifying energy, — come down at once into close proximity with the dwellings of men, and render themselves visible to physical sight, in angelic splendor, and celestial glory.

Of such a visit, in such circumstances, what ought we to consider would be the natural results upon earth's countless multitudes? What, less than the phenomena revealed through the apostle? Suppose their production, then, to be the chief design of the visit.

Taking into consideration the degree of spiritual advancement which, according to the supposition, will at that time have been reached by the inhabitants of earth, evincing, in each, a development of " the inward man," or spiritual organism, to an extent not only unattained as yet, but scarcely by us conceivable, it should by no means be deemed

incredible that, upon the simultaneous advent to earth of so many myriads from the celestial realms, glowing with more than sun-like brightness, their countenances radiant with the quickening power of the all-conquering Son of God, just such a change as Paul describes would occur instantaneously, and be immediately followed by such an ascension, — in that the animal organizations of those then in the flesh would be dissolved "in a moment," — their spiritual organizations be perfected and quickened "in the twinkling of an eye," — and the thus new-born celestials (, a whole worldful,) be attracted, even by structural levitation, not to say by a sacred sympathy, up to that aerial altitude at which Jesus would be waiting.

"The whole family in heaven and earth" being now, even literally, "gathered together in one", they ascend, with rejoicing, to the home of the Saviour, in the house, even the heaven, of the "Father of all." And the work of Christ being finished as the Viceroy of Jehovah, he (, that God, even the Father, may be all in all,) now delivers up his kingdom, taking rank but as a subject of the Universal Sovereign, and the Scripture is fulfilled which says, "Then," is

"THE END."

# INDEX

## OF ARGUMENTS, EXPOSITIONS, &c.


Page.

Pharisees admitted, Sadducees denied, the fact of a resurrection ..... 9
Common mistake as to the Pharisees' doctrine concerning the resurrection. Their doctrine equivalent to that of the transmigration of souls ..... 10
(What some Elias-John, or John-Elias, is needed for in this age.) ..... 11
The phrase "born in sins" explained ..... 12
Manner and time of soul-transmigrations as held by the Pharisees ..... 13
The Pharisees' doctrine as to the resurrection, and their doctrine of possession by demons, closely allied ..... 13
The Sadducees' denial of any resurrection equivalent to a denial that there is any future life ..... 14
The difficulty resolved that John, the Baptist, is said to be and not to be Elias ..... 15
The *spirit* or *soul* of man defined ..... 17
Pneuma, Phantasma, Psuche, defined ..... 18
Sense (, in some texts,) of the phrases "my soul," "his soul," &c ..... 18
Life of the body. Dying ..... 19
Zoë. Anthropos ..... 19
Man not a *dual* being ..... 19
Death represented by a falling; life after death, by a rising; .. 19
—— also symbolized by sleeping; life after death, by waking .. 20
Anistemi, Egeiro, (including Egeiromai,) Anastasis, Egersis ... 20
Remarks on the word *resurrection*, as coming from the Latin "*resurrectio*", also, as being a translation of the Greek "anastasis" ..... 21
Unusual senses of anastasis and anistemi; also, of egeiro (in the passive form) ..... 22
"The dead", a *plural* expression, — Hoi Nekroi, plural also. 23
—— are usually dead persons; in a few rare instances, dead bodies ..... 23
"The resurrection *of* the dead" and "the resurrection *from* the dead," not the same in import ..... 23
Wrong rendering in Acts iv. 2 ..... 25
Apo and Ek or Ex defined, and the sense of each illustrated .... 26
"*From* the dead", its rare sense, and its usual sense ..... 27
Hades, Literally, something *not seen*. Used for the state or condition of "*the dead*," they being invisible to physical sight .. 28
——. The usage of the term in the New Testament ..... 29
——, in the Scriptures, not the name of a place, except by a rhetorical figure ..... 29
Aidios. Its true sense, in the New Testament, "unseen" ..... 31

Page.
Risings from the dead,—all to a state of mortality excepting Christ's alone ... 32
Proofs that Christ laid down the life of his fleshly body, and afterward resumed it ... 33
Aparche. Usually rendered "first fruits."—Properly, "a sample," or "a specimen." ... 34
"The resurrection *from* the dead" specifically defined ... 34
Supposed peculiar sense, in at least two texts, of the phrase rendered "from the dead" ... 35
"A natural body" and "a spiritual body."—The former properly "an animal body." ... 36
Psuchikos. Pneumatikos ... 37
The two kinds of bodies mentioned by Paul, specifically defined. 37
Zoöpoieo. Usually rendered "quicken." ... 37
———, its *primary* sense ... 38
———, its sense as applied to man in the future life ... 38
———, its sense as applied to persons in this mode of being .. 38
Phthartos, Thnetos, Phthora, Diaphthoria, To Thneton, Aphthartos, (Athanatos,) Aphtharsia ... 39
"Incorruption," in the common rendering, should be "incorruptibility." ... 40
"Immortality," in one place in the Common Version, should be "incorruptness" ... 40
Athanasia ... 40
Both incorruptibility and immortality, when affirmed of man in the hereafter life. have reference solely to bodily organization. 41
Akatalutos ... 41
Thoughts on the resurrectional organism as being incorruptible and immortal ... 41
Remarks on the text affirming that God "only hath immortality." ... 42
Allassomai (from allasso) ... 45
A miraculous "change." ... 46
The Scripture doctrine of immortality, not invalidated by certain fine-spun theorizings, were they even proved ... 46
"The resurrection of the dead," specifically defined ... 47
"The quickening of the dead", defined ... 47
The resurrection indispensable to future life.—This argued from Christ's argumentation addressed to the Sadducees; ... 48
Also, from what Paul says as to Christians *perishing* if there were no resurrection ... 49
The question as to the "why" of the above argued fact, answered in the spirit of Matt. xi. 26 ... 49
Word rendered "gospel." ... 49
Remarks on the phrase "in Christ." ... 50
An inner organism argued—from what is said, *in one text*, about the "outward man" and "the inward"; ... 51
Also, from "the whole creation" being in *labor*; ... 52
Also, from the existence of spiritual sight and hearing ... 53
Rationale of the future-life thought ... 54
Aion. In the sense of *age* ... 54
The preposition Eis ... 55
Aion, in the sense of Spiritual Being ... 56
——, in the sense of *life*, or mode of being ... 56
——, defined, Lexicon-wise ... 57
Aionios defined ... 58

Page.
Aionios, in the sense of "pertaining to the age"..... 58
———-, in the sense of age-lasting..... 59
———-, in the sense of "lasting."..... 59
Aionios *life*, mostly spiritual or religious life. Sometimes, perhaps, celestial life..... 59
Spiritual or religious life defined..... 60
*Death*, as the opposite, or rather the *absence* of spiritual life.. 61
Words rendered "judgment."..... 62
Word rendered "perdition"..... 62
Diabolos. Usually rendered "devil." Its Scriptural application..... 64—66
Satanas. Specific difference in signification between the terms devil and satan..... 66
Satanas or satan not a proper name..... 66
*Possessing* spirits or devils, properly *demons*. These defined. Supposed to be the cause of various diseases..... 67
"A spirit of divination." Query as to it..... 68
Why demons were deemed "unclean"..... 68
Word rendered "angel," Signifies, in general, *messenger*. Sometimes, also, representative..... 71
Heaven, what it imports literally,—its various applications,—the Christian sense of the term..... 71
———-, the name of a *place*, as well as of a state..... 71
———-, hints as to its *locality*..... 72
A "*couchant*" objection rendered at least *dormant*..... 72
Word rendered "heaven", often pluralized in the Scriptures... 73
Query as to an actual *plurality* of spiritual heavens..... 73
*Coming* of Christ. Parousia..... 73
Two comings of Christ after His first appearance among men.. 74
Suppositions tending to a solution of the problem whether or not Adam was created immortal..... 75
Remarks on certain texts which speak of death as resulting from sin..... 76
Argument from the Scripture position that "*the gospel*" is calculated to "comfort" at least all *Christian* mourners..... 80
"The last enemy."..... 81
Argument from the Scripture declaration that *death* is to be at last "destroyed"..... 82
Destruction of cities, nations, &c..... 83
What is meant by being cast out of God's presence..... 84
"Everlasting destruction" explained..... 85
Comments on certain texts teaching the destruction of individuals..... 86
"The second death."..... 88
"Eternal life" *not* the same as immortal life. The former, however, to be at length universal..... 89
The *materiality* of the soul and the indestructibility of matter, if proved, no proof of the soul's endless existence, much less of its life..... 90
Christ shows that the so-called "dead" are in reality "living" 91
Comments on the text, "Man giveth up the ghost, and where is he"?..... 92
————- on the text, "In that very day his thoughts perish". 93
Admission that the Scriptures do not assert the immortality of the soul..... 96

Page.
Argument from the presence of Moses and Elias on the mount of our Lord's transfiguration ..... 99
The transfiguration of Christ, a reality ..... 100
The "bright cloud." "The glory of the Lord." ..... 102
Argument from the text, "I go to prepare a place for you," &c. 104
——— from "joy in the presence of the angels of God," &c.. 105
——— from "Paul's desire to depart, and to be with Christ." 106
——— from "We walk by faith, not by sight," &c ..... 107
Exposition of the text, "The dead know not any thing," &c... 108
Sleep put for death ..... 112
Quotation from an old School Book ..... 114
Resurrection of the earthly body, however explained, impossible in most cases ..... 115
Supposed amputation of the leg of a "mite." ..... 116
Resurrection of the earthly body, useless ..... 117
———————————, unscriptural ..... 117
Answer to the argument from Christ's taking on his former body ..... 118
Remarks on the texts, "shall also quicken your mortal bodies," and "shall change our vile body." ..... 119
——— on Ezekiel's vision of dry bones ..... 120
——— on the account that "many bodies of the saints which slept, arose." ..... 121
Arguments drawn from the facts that no direct mention is made of more than *one* resurrection in 1 Cor. 15th, nor in all Paul's Epistles, nor in Christ's conversation with the Sadducees; and that Paul, when before Felix, spoke of "*a* resurrection" including "*both* just and unjust." ..... 124
Remarks on the text mentioning those who "shall be accounted worthy," &c ..... 127
——— on "the resurrection of the just." ..... 128
Comments upon those *three* texts which directly teach two resurrections in some sense ..... 130—132
A brief millenium ..... 133
Spiritual or religious resurrections ..... 134
Nineteenth-Century Christians,—small prospect of their sharing in the first resurrection ..... 135
Proofs that the "time of trouble" predicted by Daniel, and the "great tribulation" foretold by Christ, were really in the siege and destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans ..... 136
Arguments from the facts that in the parable of the sheep and goats—, so called,—nothing is said of a resurrection; nor in 1 Cor. 15th is any thing said of a judgment; and that no where, in the Scriptures, are the resurrection and the judgment set forth as accompanying events ..... 136—139
Remarks on the text wherein Christ avers that his "word" shall "judge" some "in the last day ..... 140
——— on the text mentioning "eternal judgment." ..... 141
Proofs that Christ was to "come" (, and this too for judgment,) at the close of the Jewish age ..... 146
Comments on the text, "He hath appointed a day," &c ..... 148
A "judgment" during the gospel day ..... 150
Illustration of those *eight* texts containing the phrase "day of judgment." ..... 151—156
"The day of judgment" is rightly—not "the", but—"*a* day" &c., except in one text ..... 152

Page.
Greek word rendered "judgment" in the phrase for day of judgment, defined.—May have the sense of "crisis."..... 152
Day of judgment, according to Peter, is sometimes equivalent to day of *punishment* or retribution;..... 154
Also, is sometimes a day of "perdition" or destruction... 154
Admissions of "eminent commentators" as to the actual teachings of some of the texts mentioning "day of judgment."... 157
Opinion of the author of this work as to the actual import of the Saviour's affirmation, "It shall be more tolerable," &c.. 157
Brief exposition of the text, "And as it is appointed to men once to die, but after this the judgment;"..... 158
Remarks on the judgment in Rev. 20th..... 160
Argument from the absurdity of supposing that a good God, other things being equal, will do just what an *Evil* god would..... 162—164
The goodness of a fruit-tree's fruit is to be judged of when the fruit is *ripe;* so the argument from God's goodness has reference only to final results..... 164
Argument from the unreasonableness of supposing that Divine justice requires an impossibility..... 165
——— from that text which declares that "Charity rejoiceth in the truth."..... 166
——— from the fact that good people sometimes suffer greatly from believing in endless punishment..... 167
——— from the consideration that benevolent feelings do *not* cease with the present life..... 170
——— from the text, "The Lord will not cast off for ever;" &c 171
——— from certain *questions* which greatly "troubled" the Psalmist..... 173
——— from the solemn declaration of God, "I will not contend for ever," &c..... 173
——— from various similar texts..... 174
Remarks on the words of David to Solomon, "If thou forsake him, he will cast thee off for ever."..... 174
——— on the parable of the sheep and goats (so called);..... 174
Also, a synopsis of an exposition thereof..... 175
Who those were who were not placed on either the right hand or the left..... 176
Argument from the apostle's comments on the text, "Thou hast put all things under his feet."..... 179
Those *five* texts considered in which a raising up at the last day is mentioned..... 182—184
Argument from the fact that in *three* of the five texts mentioning the last-day resurrection, the raising is promised to believers only..... 183
——— from the consideration that "the last day" is a natural expression for the *terminus* of that period Scripturally denominated "the last days."..... 185
——— from the fact in the last day unbelievers were to be *judged*..... 186
——— from the consideration that raising and judging in the last day are evidently the same as the two resurrections in John 5th..... 186
——— from the highly figurative language found in connection with the last-day resurrection..... 187

Page

Probable idea of Martha when she spoke of her brother's rising at the last day ..... 187
How Judas was lost ..... 189
Did Judas hang himself? ..... 190
New rendering of John xi, 25, 26 ..... 192
An original rendering (, in a few texts,) of the phrase "eis ton aiona" ..... 192
Argument from what Paul claimed to "know," in 2 Cor. v. 1. 194
——— from the apostle's apparent repugnance to being "unclothed", or divested of a bodily organization ..... 196
A Jewish manner of expressing a strong preference ..... 196
A *second* argument from what Paul says as to Christians *perishing* if there were no resurrection ..... 197
A *third* argument from what Paul says as to Christians *perishing* if there were no resurrection ..... 198
Argument from Paul's making mention of those "that are heavenly." ..... 200
Objection to the common doctrine concerning angels, that no Scripture account exists of heir creation as such ..... 203
Angels such by virtue of office ..... 204
Objection to the notion that angels are mere appearances ..... 204
Three objections to the doctrine that all human beings become angels at de th ..... 205
Several objections to the common doctrine concerning *evil* angels ..... 206
The devil's angels, the devil's preachers, satan's ministers ..... 207
"Apollyon." "Bottomless pit." ..... 209
The "evil spirit" which "troubled" king Saul ..... 211
The "lying spirit" which "enticed" king Ahab ..... 211
Direct Scriptural proof that the spiritual angels are all good beigs ..... 213
Official business of angels ..... 215
Guardian angels ..... 217
The angels of certain "little ones." ..... 218
Peter's "angel." ..... 219
Proposed rendering of Heb. i. 13, 14 ..... 221
Have all persons angelic guardians? ..... 221
Powers or capabilities of angels ..... 223
The means by which the LORD "stirred up the spirit" of king Cyrus ..... 225
What of "spiritual manifestations"? ..... 225
Nature of angels, or their mode of being ..... 227
Origin of angels. Testimony going to show that they are departed human beings ..... 229
Four interesting questions answered ..... 330
A new proof of an after-death life ..... 234
Christ's reply to the Sadducees considered at some length ..237—243
A present or passing resurrection argued from various points in our Lord's reply to the Sadducees ..... 237—243
Objections answered:
1. That the tenses of Greek verbs are not always reliable as to time ..... 243
2. That the future tense sometimes occurs in texts relating to the resurrection ..... 242

Page.
3. That the present tense, when used in connection with the resurrection, must have a future sense, because we are told, in one place, that God "calleth those things that are not as though they were."..... 244
4. That the Sadducees used the future tense in putting their question to Christ..... 246
5. That Christ made use of the future tense in His answer to the Sadducees..... 247
Denial that He, in replying to the Sadducees, made use of a tense clearly future..... 247
Three arguments to show that in His reply to the Sadducees, our Lord actually had reference to just that division of time which His language naturally indicates..... 248
Objections answered:
6. That the infinitive verb "to obtain" *may* have a future sense..... 249
7. That we read, "For David is not ascended into the heavens."..... 251
Argument from the text, "The Father raiseth up the dead", &c 253
——— from the text speaking of "God, who raiseth the dead," &c..... 255
——— from the true rendering of Acts xxvi. 8..... 255
——— from Paul's applying the present tense to the resurrection a dozen or more of times in 1 Cor. 15th..... 256
——— from Paul's coupling the verb "is raised" four times in one sentence with the verb "is sown."..... 257
——— from his coupling the present tense with *past* tenses... 258
——— from his using the present of the *passive* instead of the present of the intransitive..... 158
——— from his making an objector say "How *are* the dead raised," &c..... 260
Objections answered:
8. That Paul says some had erred, saying that the resurrection is past already."..... 262
9. That Christ is declared to "the first-born from the dead." 262
"First-born" shown sometimes to relate—not to priority, but —to dignity or *eminence*..... 264
Objection answered:
10. That Paul, before Agrippa, spoke expressly concerning Christ, that it had been predicted of Him "that He should be the first that should rise from the dead."..... 265
Acts xxvi. 23, shown to have been subjected to a singularly unfaithful rendering..... 265
The common rendering of a certain Greek phrase in Acts xxvi. 23, compared with the rendering of the same phrase in Rom. i 4..... 265
Supposed *philosophy* of the common rendering of a certain Greek phrase in Rom. i. 4..... 266
Acts xxvi. 23, rendered after the manner of Rom. i. 4..... 267
The questions considered at some length, what it is that is sown, and what it is that is raised, where the apostle says, "It is sown in corruption; it is raised in incorruption," &c...268—276
A literal rendering of 1 Cor. xv. 35-38, 42-44..... 272
A paraphrastic rendering of 1 Cor. xv. 42-44..... 275
A free translation of 1 Cor. xv. 42-44..... 275

Page.
The primitive gospel, as announced by the first Christian preachers, mostly historical.... 277
The order of events only partially given in the Gospels.... 279
The idea advanced that where Paul seems to be declaring the order of Christ's appearings, he is simply recounting the order of subjects presented in certain discourses of his.... 279
One real discrepancy in the accounts of Mary Magdalene's movements on the morning of Christ's resurrection.—This easily accounted for; the mistake a perfectly natural one; her actual movements known;—the existence of the discrepancy by no means detracts any thing from the credibility of the Gospel History.... 280
Brief narrative of a train of events preceding, including, attending, and following our Lord's Crucifixion.... 283—292
"Assurance rendered doubly sure" that Jesus, when taken from the cross, was, as to His body, actually dead.... 291
Our Saviour's Resurrection, and Appearings.... 293—300
Criticism on John xx. 28.... 299
Christ's Ascension.... 301
Some of the proofs of the existence of a future life for man.. 304—310
A child's philosophy.
Originals of the heathen gods and goddesses.... 304
Argument from the fact that it seems to be *natural* for man to believe in an other life.... 305
Our Saviour's anti-Sadducean argument and a similar one.... 305
In what estimation the first Christians held the fact of Christ's resurrection as evidence of the existenee of a future life.... 306
How the first Christians came by their "hope."... 306
A new and surprising event in the childhood of the race, illustrating the manner in which life and immortality were brought to light through the gospel.... 308
"The offense of the cross."... 310
Supposed philosophy of Paul's argumentation in 1 Cor. 15th... 310
*Some* of the effects which the evidences of Christianity produced in the views and feelings of the early Christians.... 313
A new Translation of 1 Cor. 15th, with preliminary remarks and appendant notes.... 315—323
Revelation as to the end of human mortality.... 324
"An atom" of time.... 326
A *personal* "coming" or arrival of Christ.... 327
A somewhat questionable *conjecture* as to the autographic reading of 1 Cor. xv. 51.... 330
A literal rendering of 1 Thess. iv. 13–17.... 331
A literal rendering of 1 Cor. xv. 23.... 332
*Death*, an "enemy".... 334
Critical remarks upon the text, "For this corruptible must put on incorruption," &c.... 336
Supposed character of the last "change."... 339
A partly paraphrastical rendering of 1 Cor. xv. 22-24.... 340
Supposed mode of operation in the production of the last "change."... 340
The Finale.... 343

17 Feb. 1860



LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
0 021 226 189 0